
00111691

THE
ASIATIC SOCIETY OF BOMBAY
Town Hall, Bombay.

Digitized with financial assistance from the
Government of Maharashtra
on 18 July, 2018

DUGALD STEWART'S WORKS.

MESSRS. CLARK have purchased the Stock of the Works of this eminent Philosopher, edited by Sir WILLIAM HAMILTON, Bart., with LIFE by Professor VEITCH, in Eleven Volumes demy 8vo, published at £6. They offer it to Subscribers to *Foreign Theological Library* and *Meyer's Commentary* at the very low price of

THREE GUINEAS.

Orders may either be sent direct or through a Bookseller.

NOTICE TO SUBSCRIBERS.

MESSRS. CLARK have pleasure in forwarding to their Subscribers the Second Issue of the FOREIGN THEOLOGICAL LIBRARY for 1881, viz.:—

MARTENSEN'S CHRISTIAN ETHICS, (Special Ethics.) Vol. I.
HAGENBACH'S HISTORY OF DOCTRINES. Vol. III. (completion).

The Issues for 1882 *will comprise:—*

DORNER'S SYSTEM OF CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE. Vols. III. and IV. (completion).
MARTENSEN'S CHRISTIAN ETHICS. (Special Ethics.) Vol. II. (completion).
and probably—
WEISS'S BIBLICAL THEOLOGY OF THE NEW TESTAMENT. Vol. I.

The Volumes issued during 1880 *and* 1881 *are:—*

GODET'S COMMENTARY ON THE EPISTLE OF ST. PAUL TO THE ROMANS Two Vols.
HAGENBACH'S HISTORY OF DOCTRINES. Three Vols.
DORNER'S SYSTEM OF CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE. Vols. I. and II.
MARTENSEN'S CHRISTIAN ETHICS. (Special Ethics.) Vol. I.

The FOREIGN THEOLOGICAL LIBRARY was commenced in 1846, and from that time to this Four Volumes yearly (or 142 in all) have appeared with the utmost regularity.

In beginning a NEW SERIES with 1880, an opportunity is given to many to subscribe who are possibly deterred by the extent of the former Series.

The Binding of the Series is modernized, so as to distinguish it from the former Series.

The Subscription Price will remain as formerly, 21s. annually for Four Volumes payable in advance. (The Subscription Price of the Volumes for 1880, 1881, 1882, is therefore Three Guineas.)

A Selection of 20 Volumes may be had at the Subscription Price of Five Guineas, from the works issued in former Series (*previous to* 1878).

Messrs. Clark take this opportunity of expressing their thanks for the favour with which this New Series of the Foreign Theological Library has been received.

May they request an early remittance of Subscription for 1882.

CLARK'S

FOREIGN

THEOLOGICAL LIBRARY.

NEW SERIES.

VOL. VIII.

Hagenbach's History of Christian Doctrines.

VOL. III.

EDINBURGH:
T. & T. CLARK, 38 GEORGE STREET.
1881.

PRINTED BY MORRISON AND GIBB,

FOR

T & T. CLARK, EDINBURGH.

LONDON, ... HAMILTON, ADAMS, AND CO.

DUBLIN, . . . GEORGE STREET.

NEW YORK, . . . SCRIBNER AND WELFORD.

A HISTORY

OF

CHRISTIAN DOCTRINES.

BY THE LATE

DR. K. R. HAGENBACH,

PROFESSOR OF THEOLOGY AT BASEL.

TRANSLATED FROM THE FIFTH AND LAST GERMAN EDITION,

WITH ADDITIONS FROM OTHER SOURCES.

111691

With an Introduction by

E. H. PLUMPTRE, D.D.,

PROFESSOR OF DIVINITY IN KING'S COLLEGE, LONDON; EXAMINING CHAPLAIN TO THE ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY.

VOL. III.

EDINBURGH:
T. & T. CLARK, 38 GEORGE STREET.
1881.


00111691

CONTENTS.

FOURTH PERIOD.

FROM THE REFORMATION TO THE RISE OF THE PHILOSOPHY OF LEIBNITZ AND WOLF IN GERMANY (1517 TO ABOUT 1720).

THE AGE OF POLEMICO-ECCLESIASTICAL SYMBOLISM.

(THE CONFLICT OF CONFESSIONS OF FAITH.)

A. GENERAL HISTORY OF DOCTRINES DURING THE FOURTH PERIOD.

3. *The Roman Catholic Church.*

§		PAGE
226.	The Council of Trent, and the Catechismus Romanus,	1
227.	The Theologians of the Roman Catholic Church,	4
228.	Jansenism,	8
229.	The Mysticism of the Roman Catholic Church,	11
230.	More Liberal Tendencies in Criticism and Systematic Theology—Transition to the following Period,	13

4. *The Greek Church.*

231.	The Greek Church,	14

5. *Minor Religious Parties (Sects).*

232.	Minor Religious Parties (Sects),	15
233.	(*a*) Anabaptists (Mennonites),	16
234.	(*b*) Unitarians (Socinians),	18
235.	(*c*) Arminians (Remonstrants),	22
236.	(*d*) Quakers,	25
237.	Attempts at Union (Syncretism),	27
238.	Influence of Philosophy—Deism—Apologetics,	28
238*a*.	[The English Deism],	32
239.	Division of the Material,	36

B. SPECIAL HISTORY OF DOCTRINES DURING THE FOURTH PERIOD.

FIRST CLASS.

THE CHARACTERISTIC DOCTRINES OF ROMANISM AND PROTESTANTISM.

(INCLUDING THE OPPOSITION BETWEEN LUTHERANS AND CALVINISTS, AND THE OPINIONS OF THE MINOR RELIGIOUS PARTIES AND SECTS.)

FIRST DIVISION.

THE DOCTRINES CONCERNING THE SOURCES OF KNOWLEDGE.

(FORMAL PRINCIPLE.)

§		PAGE
240.	Roman Catholicism and Protestantism,	39
241.	Divergent Views of some Sects— (*a*) The Mystical Principle,	49
242.	(*b*) The Rationalistic Principle (Socinians),	54
243.	Further Development of the Doctrine concerning the Holy Scriptures (Inspiration and Interpretation),	55
244.	Relation of Scripture to Tradition,	67

SECOND DIVISION.

ANTHROPOLOGY, JUSTIFICATION, AND THE ECONOMY OF REDEMPTION.

(MATERIAL PRINCIPLE.)

(*a*) ANTHROPOLOGY.

245.	Man before the Fall,	71
246.	The Fall and its Consequences (Original Sin)—(Definitions of the Symbols),	77
247.	Antagonisms within the Confessions,	86
248.	Further Development of the Doctrine in Theology and Life,	88

(*b*) THE DOCTRINE OF SALVATION.

249.	Freedom and Grace. Predestination (according to different Confessions),	95
250.	Controversies respecting Predestination within the various Confessions,	107

§ PAGE
251. Justification and Sanctification. Faith and Works, . . 111
252. Fluctuations within the various Confessions, . . . 117
253. The Economy of Salvation, ... 120

THIRD DIVISION.

THE DOCTRINES CONCERNING THE CHURCH AND ITS MEANS OF GRACE, CONCERNING SAINTS, IMAGES, THE SACRIFICE OF THE MASS, AND PURGATORY.

(THE PRACTICAL CONSEQUENCES.)

254. Introduction, ... 122
255. The Church and Ecclesiastical Power, ... 123
256. Further Development of the Doctrine concerning the Church, . 135
257. Worship of Saints and Images, ... 137
258. The Sacraments, ... 140
259. The Sacrifice of the Mass. The Lord's Supper, . . . 148
260. Internal Fluctuations and further Doctrinal Development, . . 169
261. The Doctrine of Purgatory, ... 173

SECOND CLASS.

DOCTRINES IN WHICH PROTESTANTS AND ROMAN CATHOLICS MORE OR LESS AGREED (IN OPPOSITION TO THE MINOR SECTS).

FIRST DIVISION.

THEOLOGY PROPER.

262. Trinitarians and Antitrinitarians, ... 176
263. The Systematic Development of the Doctrine concerning God, together with its Mystical and Speculative Aspects, . . 183
264. Creation and Preservation of the World. Providence and Government of the World, ... 188
265. Angels and Devils, ... 193

SECOND DIVISION.

CHRISTOLOGY AND SOTERIOLOGY (INCLUDING THE DOCTRINE CONCERNING BAPTISM AND ESCHATOLOGY).

266. The Person of Christ, ... 197
267. Further Doctrinal Development and Internal Controversies, . 206
268. The Doctrine of Atonement, ... 209

§ PAGE
269. Differences within the Lutheran and Reformed Churches, and further Doctrinal Development, ... 218
270. Doctrine of Baptism, ... 219
271. Eschatology, ... 226

FIFTH PERIOD.

FROM THE YEAR 1720 TO THE PRESENT DAY.

THE AGE OF CRITICISM, OF SPECULATION, AND OF THE ANTAGONISMS BETWEEN FAITH AND KNOWLEDGE, PHILOSOPHY AND CHRISTIANITY, REASON AND REVELATION; AND OF ATTEMPTS TO RECONCILE THESE ANTAGONISMS.

A. GENERAL HISTORY OF DOCTRINES DURING THE FIFTH PERIOD.

272. Introduction, ... 230
273. Influence of Philosophy upon Theology, ... 233
274. The Philosophy of Wolf, ... 233
275. Influence of Deism and Naturalism—Rationalizing Attempts, . 237
276. Apologetic Efforts—Changes in the Mode of Treating Theology—Modern Compendiums of Systematic Theology, . . . 243
277. Reaction—Edict of Religion—Orthodox Pietism, . . . 250
278. Zinzendorf and the United Brethren—Wesley and the Methodists—Swedenborg, ... 253
279. The Philosophy of Kant—Rationalism and Supernaturalism, . 257
280. Modern Speculative Philosophy—Fichte—Schelling, . . 263
281. Herder and Jacobi—De Wette and Schleiermacher, . . 267
282. Attempts at Restoration—Practical Piety and Modern Theology, . 270
283. The Philosophy of Hegel and the young Hegelians, . . . 274
284. The Latest Rationalistic Reaction, ... 279
285. The Protestant Church and Doctrine outside of Germany, . . 281
285. (*a*) [Theology in England in the Eighteenth Century], . . 286
285. (*b*) [English Theology and Philosophy in the Present Century], . 288
285. (*c*) [Theology and Philosophy in Scotland], ... 291
285. (*d*) [Theology in the United States of America—New England—Edwards and his School], ... 294
286. Conflicts of the Confessions, ... 297
287. The Roman Catholic Church—German Catholicism, . . 299
288. The Russo-Greek Church, ... 305

B. SPECIAL HISTORY OF DOCTRINES DURING THE FIFTH PERIOD.

FIRST DIVISION.

PROLEGOMENA—RELIGION—REVELATION—BIBLE AND TRADITION.

(MIRACLES AND PROPHECIES.)

§		PAGE
289.	Religion,	306
290.	Truth and Divinity of Christianity—Perfectibility—Reason and Revelation,	309
291.	The Word of God—Scripture and Tradition—Scripture and Spirit,	312
292.	Inspiration of Scripture—Interpretation—Miracles and Prophecy,	314

SECOND DIVISION.

THEOLOGY PROPER—CREATION AND PROVIDENCE—THE DOCTRINE CONCERNING ANGELS AND DEVILS.

293.	Deism—Theism—Pantheism,	322
294.	The Existence and Attributes of God,	324
295.	The Doctrine of the Trinity,	327
296.	Creation and Preservation of the World—Providence—Theodicy,	332
297.	Angels and Devils,	334

THIRD DIVISION.

ANTHROPOLOGY—CHRISTOLOGY—SOTERIOLOGY AND THE ECONOMY OF SALVATION.

298.	The Doctrines concerning Man, Sin, and Liberty,	338
299.	Christology,	343
300.	The Doctrine of Atonement,	353
301.	The Economy of Salvation—Justification and Sanctification (Faith and Works)—Grace and Liberty—Predestination,	362

FOURTH DIVISION.

THE CHURCH—THE SACRAMENTS—ESCHATOLOGY.

302.	The Doctrines concerning the Church,	369
303.	The Means of Grace—(The Sacraments),	374
304.	Eschatology,	382
	INDEX,	391

FOURTH PERIOD.

FROM THE REFORMATION TO THE RISE OF THE PHILOSOPHY OF LEIBNITZ AND WOLF IN GERMANY: FROM THE YEAR 1517 TO ABOUT 1720.

THE AGE OF POLEMICO-ECCLESIASTICAL SYMBOLISM.

(THE CONFLICT OF CONFESSIONS OF FAITH.)

A.—GENERAL HISTORY OF DOCTRINES DURING THE FOURTH PERIOD.

III. THE ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH.

§ 226.

The Council of Trent, and the Catechismus Romanus.

†*Sarpi* (Pietro Soave Polano), Istoria del Concilio di Trento, Lond. 1619. ["It was generally looked upon as the rarest piece of history the world ever saw," Bp. *Burnet.* Translated into English by Sir *N. Brent*, Lond. 1696. The Lond. ed. of 1619 was edited by *De Dominis.* French transl. by *Courayer*, 2 vols., Amst. 1736.] †*Pallavicini*, Istoria del Conc. di Trento, Rom. 1656, 2 vols. fol., Milan 1717; Latin, by *Guttini*, 1673; in French, 3 vols. 1844; translated into German by †*Klitsche*, Augsburg 1835. *Chemnitii* Examen Concilii Tridentini, Francof. 1707, ed. by *Preuss*, Berl. 1862. *Salig*, Vollständige Historie des Tridentinischen Conciliums, Halle 1741 ff., 3 vols. 4to. †*J. M. Göschl*, Geschichtliche Darstellung des grossen allgemeinen Concils zu Trient, Regensb. 1840, 2 vols. *Danz*, Gesch. des Trident. Concils nach der Darstellung eines Katholischen Schriftstellers, Jena 1846. *Marheinecke*, System des Katholicismus (see vol. i. § 16). *J. P. Lange*, Die gesetzlich-katholische Kirche, als Sinnbild der freien evang.-kathol. Kirche, Heidelberg 1850. [*J. Egli*, Das heilige Conc. von Trient, Luzern 1835. Comp. *Ranke's*

Hist. of Popes, on Sarpi; on Pallavicini; on Trent, et passim. *J. N. Brischar*, Beurtheilung Sarpi's u. Pallavic., Tüb. 1843, 2 Bde. *Ellies du Pin*, Hist. du Concile de Trente, 2 vols. 4to, Bruxelles 1721. *Bungener*, Histoire du Concile de Trente, Paris 1847, 2 vols., and in Eng. *T. A. Buckley*, Hist. of Council of Trent, Lond. 1832. Histoire du Concile de Trente, Lyon et Paris 1851, 2 vols. *V. Loch*, Canones et Decreta sacrosancti œc. Conc. Trid., Lat. and Germ., Ratisb. 1869. Acta Genuina SS. œc. Concil. Trid., Lips. 1874, fol. *J. J. I. von Döllinger*, Sammlung von Urkunden zur Geschichte des Concils von Trient, 1876.]

CONFRONTED by Protestantism, the Roman Catholic Church found itself under the necessity of examining its own condition. It had to perform a twofold task—viz. *first*, to secure the doctrines which it confessed from misrepresentations and false inferences; and, *secondly*, to hold fast, with renewed vigour, that which its principles bound it to maintain. The Council of Trent (1545–1593) had therefore to enlighten the Roman Catholic Church on its own position, and solemnly to sanction its system (developed to a great extent by the scholastics of the preceding period) in conscious opposition to the demands of the Reformers. The declarations of this Council (1), as well as those set forth in the Roman Catechism, which was based upon the utterances of the Council (2), are therefore to be regarded as the true symbols of the Roman Catholic Church, and every doctrine which deviates from these must renounce all claim to catholicity.

(1) Canones et Decreta Concilii Tridentini Rom. 1564, 4to. In the same year several editions were published at Rome, Venice, Antwerp, Louvain, Cöln, and many others; Lyons 1580 (with the Index Librorum Prohibitorum). In later times, editions have been published by *J. Gallemart*, Cöln 1618, 1620; Antw. 1644; Lyons 1712; by *Phil. Chiffelet*, Antw. 1640, and **Jodoc. le Plat*, Antw. 1779, 4to (comp. *Walch*, Bibl. Theol. tom. i. p. 407 ss.), reprinted by *Streitwolf* and *Danz*. As regards the History of Doctrines and Symbolism, the Sessions 4–7, 13, 14, 21–25, are of special importance. [See above in Literature. Canons and Decrees, transl. by *T. A. Buckley*, Lond. 1851; and by *James Waterworth*, Lond. 1848.] — The *Professio Fidei Tridentinæ*, based upon the canons of the council, was drawn up, A.D. 1564, by order of

Pope Pius IV., and no one could obtain either an ecclesiastical office or an academical dignity, etc., without subscribing it. It is in the Bullar. Roman. tom. ii. p. 127 ss. (and in the form of an appendix in the earlier edition of *Winer*). Comp. *G. Ch. F. Mohnicke*, Urkundliche Geschichte der sogenannten Professio fidei Trident., etc., Greifswald 1822. *Winer*, s. 9. *Bungener*, Histoire du Concile de Trente, Paris 1847, 2 vols. *Preuss*, u.s.

(2) The Catechismus Romanus was composed (in accordance with a resolution of the Council of Trent, Sess. 25) by Archbishop *Leon Marino*, Bishop *Egidius Foscarari*, and *Fr. Fureiro*, a Portuguese scholar, under the superintendence of three cardinals, and published A.D. 1566, by authority of Pope Pius IV. (the Latin version by *Paul Manutius*). Several editions and translations into the modern languages have been published; *e.g.* that of Mainz 1834, for general use. In the earlier editions nothing but the text was given, without any division; in the edition of Cöln 1572, it was for the first time divided into books and chapters; that of Antwerp 1574 contained questions and answers. The Catechism consists of four parts: De Symbolo Apostolico, de Sacramentis, de Decalogo, and de Oratione Dominica. On the relation in which the Catechism stands to the canons of the Council of Trent, and the inferior importance assigned to it by the Jesuits and other Roman Catholic theologians, see *Winer*, l.c. [The Catechism for the Curates, composed by the decree of the Council of Trent. Faithfully translated, permissu superiorum, Lond. 1687. A translation by *T. A. Buckley*, Lond. 1852. Comp. *Köllner*, Symbolik, ii. 166–190.]

The catechisms composed by the Jesuit *P. Canisius* (the larger of which appeared 1554, the smaller 1566), which acquired greater currency than the Catechismus Romanus, have not received the papal sanction, and on that account cannot be regarded as symbolical books; but they excited more attention, and gave rise to new controversies. Comp. *Joh. Wigand*, Warnung vor dem Catechismus des Dr. Canisii, des grossen Jesuwidders (!), Jena 1570, 4to. The Confutatio (comp. § 215, note 2) might also be regarded as a document which sets forth the principles of Romanism, in opposition to Protestantism; but it was not formally sanctioned by the Church.

[Among the secondary sources are the *Roman Missal* and the *Breviary*. See *Köllner*, ii. 190 ff. The Council of Trent ordered the revision of the Missal, published in 1570; again in 1604, which is followed in all the reprints. On the Breviarium, see Köcher, Bibl. Symbol. i. 755 ss.; it is so called because in it the previous offices were abbreviated (under Gregory VII.).]

§ 227.

The Theologians of the Roman Catholic Church.

Hugo Laemmer, Die vortridentinische katholische Theologie des Reformationszeitalters aus den Quellen, Berlin 1858.

Among the theologians who defended the old doctrinal system of the Church during the age of the Reformation (1), along with *Eck*, *Faber*, *Cochlæus*, and others, *Desiderius Erasmus* occupied the most prominent place, though he did not transmit to posterity a system of dogmatic theology (2). To this period also belongs *Albert Pighius* (3), whom Calvin opposed. After the Council of Trent the members of the Order of Jesus in particular (4) made the defence of modern Romanism (both theoretically and practically) the task of their lives. The most conspicuous doctrinal and polemical writer among them was *Robert Bellarmine* (5); while *Dionysius Petavius* endeavoured to prove historically the antiquity of the Catholic faith (6). The following writers on dogmatic theology (and ethics) belonged to the order of the Jesuits: *Peter Canisius* (7), *Alphonse Salmeron* (8), *John Maldonatus* (9), *Francis Suarez* (10), *Gabriel Vasquez* (11), *Francis Coster* (12), *Martin Becanus* (13), and others. Among the opponents of the Jesuits and their scholastic method, *Melchior Canus*, a Dominican monk, was the most distinguished (14). *Jacques Bénigne Bossuet*, the acute and able Bishop of Meaux, by idealizing Catholicism as much as was possible, endeavoured to render it more agreeable to Protestants; while, on the other hand, he showed the variations which Protestant doctrines had undergone within a short space of time (15).

(1) On *Thomas Cajetan* (who wrote a commentary on Thomas Aquinas), *Eck*, *Faber*, *Cochlæus*, *Wimpina*, *Ambrose Catharinus*, and others, see the works on the history of the Reformation, and *Bouginé*, Literaturgeschichte, ii. s. 70 ff., and *Laemmer*, l.c. [*Cajetan*, Opera Omnia, 5 vols. fol., Lugd. 1639.

His translation of the Bible was literal. For his liberal views he was assailed by the Dominican Catharinus.] On *George Wizel*, who returned to the Roman Church (he was born A.D. 1501, and died 1573; *he wrote:* Via Regia, Helmst. 1650, De sacris nostri Temporis Controversiis, ibid. 1650), comp. **Neander*, De Georgio Vicelio., Berol. 1839, 4to, and by the *same:* Das Eine und Mannigfache des christlichen Lebens, Berlin 1840, s. 167 ff.

(2) *Erasmus* [born 1467] died at Basel A.D. 1536. The most important of his controversial writings, in which he opposed Luther's notions concerning the will of man, are mentioned in the Special History of Doctrines. Comp. **Ad. Müller*, Leben des Erasmus von Rotterdam, Hamb. 1828. English Lives by *Pennington* and *Drummond*.

(3) The family name of Pighius was Von Campen; he died as provost of the church of St. John at Utrecht, Dec. 1542. *Works:* De Hierarchia Ecclesiast., and De libero Hominis Arbitrio et Div. Gratia, libri x., Colon. 1542. See *Bayle*, Diction., and *Schweizer*, Centraldogmen, i. s. 180 ff.

(4) On the foundation of this order by *Ignatius Loyola* (1534–1540), see the works on ecclesiastical history. Respecting the doctrinal views of the Jesuits (Mariolatry), see *Baumgarten-Crusius*, Compendium der Dogmengesch. i. s. 394, 395. [*Ranke*, Hist. Popes, passim. The literature in *Gieseler*, v. § 54. Abbé *Guettée*, Hist. des Jésuites, Paris, 2 vols. 1859. *Hüber*, Hist. of Jesuits, in German and in Fr., 2 vols.]

(5) "*As a controversialist, he was the best writer of his age*" (Bayle). *Bellarmine* was born A.D. 1542, at Monte-Pulciano, in Tuscany, entered the order of the Jesuits 1560, was appointed Cardinal 1599, Archbishop of Capua 1602, and died 1621. *He wrote:* Disputationes de Controversiis Fidei adv. hujus Temporis Hæreticos, Ingolst. 1581, 1582, 2 vols. fol.; 1592, 3 vols. fol.; Venet. 1594, 3 vols. fol. This work was opposed not only by Protestants, but also by some Roman Catholics. See *Schröckh*, Kg. nach der Reformation, iv. s. 260 ff. The best Protestant work written against Bellarmine was that of *J. A. Scherzer* (he died 1683), Antibellarminus, Lips. 1681, 4to. [In 1607, *Bellarmine* published a volume of corrections of the previous editions of his work, under the

title Recognitio Librorum, incorporated in the editions of 1615, 1620, Paris 1635; Prague 1721; reprinted, Rome, 4 vols. 4to, 1832–1840, with an Appendix, Monument. Eccles. The best edition is that of 1620; that of Venice, 1721–1727, omits several of B.'s works.]

(6) *Petavius* (Pétau) was born at Orleans A.D. 1583, and died at Paris 1652. He wrote Opus de Theologicis Dogmatibus, Par. 1644–1650, 4 vols., Antw. 1700, 6 vols.; *Heinrich*, s. 377 ff. His method was adopted by *Ludw. Thomassin*, in his Dogmata Theologica, 1680–1684. See *Heinrich*, s. 582. [*Petavius* was prof. of theology at Paris from 1621. Muratori represents him as the reviver of dogmatic theology. The Antwerp (really Amsterdam) edition of 1700, in 6 tom., was edited by *Johannes Clericus*, under the pseudonym of Theophilus Alettinus, who in his preface defends him against *Bull* in respect to the Trinity. This is also done by Hefele in his account of the Arian Controversy in vol. i. of his Hist. of the Councils, Ger. and Eng. The edition of *Zacharia*, Venice 1757, is the best. Several new editions have been published at Rome, at Paris, and at Bar-le-duc. *Gibbon* says of Petav. (Decline and Fall, chap. xlvii. note 1): "His Dogm. Theolog. is a work of incredible labour and compass, the volumes which relate solely to the incarnation are divided into sixteen books. . . . The Jesuit's learning is copious and correct; his Latinity is pure, his method clear, his argument profound and well connected; but he is the slave of the Fathers, the scourge of heretics, and the enemy of truth and candour as often as they are inimical to the Catholic cause." Comp. also *Kuhn*, Dogmatik, i. 505 sq., who represents him as introducing a new method, neither scholastic nor speculative, but positive, in the treatment of theology.]

(7) The original name of *Canisius* was *de Hondt*; he was born A.D. 1511, and died 1597. He was the *author* of a Summa Doctrinæ Christianæ (Institutiones Christianæ), Par. 1528, fol., and of the two catechisms mentioned § 226.

(8) *Salmeron* was born at Toledo, and died A.D. 1585. His works were published at Madrid 1597–1602. Cöln 1612, 16 vols. fol.

(9) *Maldonatus* was born A.D. 1534, taught in the Universities of Salamanca and Paris, and died 1583. His *works*

appeared at Paris 1643, 1677, 3 vols. fol. See *Heinrich*, s. 302 ff. *Schröckh*, iv. s. 83. [He opposed the Jesuit view of the Immaculate Conception of the Virgin as necessary to the faith. He was called to Rome by Gregory XIII. to superintend the publication of the Septuagint.]

(10) *Suarez* died A.D. 1617, at Lisbon. *He wrote:* Commentatio in Thomæ Summam, Mogunt. 1649–1659, 19 vols. fol. [Repub. in Paris by *Vivès.*]

(11) *Vasquez* died A.D. 1604, at Alcala. *He wrote:* Commentarii in Thomam, Ingolst. 1606. Ven. 1608. Antw. 1621.

(12) *Coster* was professor of theology and philosophy in the University of Cöln, provincial of his order in the Rhine provinces, and died A.D. 1619. *He wrote:* Enchiridion præcipuarum Controvers. in Religione.—Meditationes (*Schröckh*, iv. s. 280).

(13) *Becan* was successively professor in the Universities of Würzburg, Mainz, and Vienna, and died 1624, as confessor to the Emperor Ferdinand II.—*He wrote:* Summa Theol.—Manuale Controversiarum hujus Temporis. (Opp. Mogunt. 1630, 1649, 2 vols. fol.)

(14) *Canus* was a native of Tarracon [born 1523], and died A.D. 1560, as provincial of his order in Castile. *He wrote:* Locorum Theol. libb. xii., Salam. 1563, fol.; Padua 1714, 4to; Venet. 1759, 4to, and Vienna 1764 (edited by *Hyacinth Serry*). Comp. *Heinrich*, s. 289 ff. *Schröckh*, iv. s. 66 ff. [See *Kuhn*, ubi supra, s. 486, and *Laemmer.*]

(15) *Bossuet* was born at Dijon A.D. 1627, was appointed Bishop of Meaux 1681, and died 1704. Among his works were: Exposition de la Doctrine de l'église Catholique, 1672, and often; edited by *Fleury*, Antw. 1678.—Histoire des Variations des églises Protestantes, Par. (and Amst.) 1688, 2 vols. He was opposed by *Basnage*, Hist. de la Rel. des églises Réformées, Rot. 1721, and *Pfaff*, Disputatt. anti-Bossuet., Tub. 1720. To these Bossuet replied by his Défense, etc., Paris 1701. Several Roman Catholics also pronounced against Bossuet's interpretation of their doctrines, *e.g. Maimbourg*, the Jesuit. See *Schröckh*, vii. s. 280 ff. Comp. *C. Schmidt* in *Herzog's* Realencykl. ii. s. 317 ff. [Œuvres, 20 vols. 4to, Paris 1743–1753. Ed. by *Bausset*, Versailles, 46 vols. Œuvres complètes de B., 59 vols., Paris 1825; 12 vols. 1836.

Gandar, Bossuet Orateur, Paris. Histoire de Bossuet par M. le Cardinal *de Bausset*, nouv. ed., Paris 1855. Mémoires et Journ. sur la Vie et les Ouvrages de Bossuet, par l'Abbé *Guettée*, 2 vols., Paris 1856. *A. Caillot*, Vie de Bossuet, Paris 1836.]

§ 228.

Jansenism.

**Reuchlin*, Geschichte von Port-Royal, der Kampf des reformirten und jesuitischen Katholicismus unter Ludwig XIII., XIV., Hamb. 1839–1844, 2 vols. See also the article in *Herzog*, vi. s. 423 ff. †*Klein*, De Jansenismi origine, doctrina, historia, Pars i. Neusse, 1863. [*Sainte-Beuve*, Hist. de Port-Royal, 4 vols., Paris 1840–1858. *Schimmelpenninck*, Memoirs of Port-Royal, 3 vols., Lond. 1855. On *Reuchlin's* work, see Sir *Jas. Stephen*, Essays, vol. i. *C. A. Wilkens*, Port-Royal, oder der Jansenismus in Frankreich, in Zeitschrift f. d. Wissenschaftliche Theologie, 1859. *J. M. Neale*, Hist. of the so-called Jansenist Church in Holland, Lond. 1857; comp. Dublin Rev. 1858. Comp. *Mozley's* Augustinian doctrine of Predestination, Lond.]

In opposition to the Jesuit and Pelagian dogmatic theology and ethics, *Jansenism* took its rise, following some earlier precedents (1), and spread from the Netherlands into France, gaining a powerful centre and support in the Congregation of Port-Royal (2). On the one hand (in reference to the doctrine of election, etc.), Jansenism showed a leaning towards the doctrine of the Protestants, and thus maintained the Protestant principle of faith within the bosom of the Roman Catholic Church; but, on the other side (as regards the Church and the sacraments), it was deeply rooted in the Catholic theory. In both respects their views were in accordance with the earlier Augustinianism, which they were desirous of restoring in all its purity (3). The theologians of Port-Royal, such as *Antoine Arnauld* (4), *Pierre Nicole* (5), and others, exerted greater influence upon the belief of their contemporaries by their practical and ascetic writings, or scientific works of a more general character, than by strictly dogmatic works. The profound *Pascal*, in particular, advanced the good

cause, both by his attacks on the casuistry of the Jesuits, and by his ingenious defence of Christianity from his point of view (6). *Pasquier Quesnel*, a priest of the Oratory, propagated Jansenistic principles, together with the New Testament, among the people, and thus exposed the Jansenists to new persecutions, and called forth new controversies (7).

(1) On the earlier manifestation of the Augustinian tendency in the Catholic Church, see *Ranke*, History of the Popes, i. s. 199, and the Special History of Doctrines.—On the doctrines of *M. Bajus* at Louvain, and the controversy to which they gave rise, respecting *Lewis Molina* and others, see ibidem. [Comp. *Mich. Baji*, Opera, Colon. 1696. *Molina*, Liberi Arbitrii cum Gratiæ Donis . . . Concordia, Lisb. 1588, Antw. 1595.—Pius v. condemned in a mild form seventy-nine theses from *Baius*, in 1557, in the bull *Ex omnibus Afflictionibus*.]

(2) *Cornelius Jansen* was born A.D. 1585, and died 1638, as Bishop of Ypern (Ypres). His principal work was edited after his death: Augustinus seu Doctrina S. Augustini de humanæ Naturæ Sanitate, Ægritudine, Medicina, adversus Pelagianos et Massilienses, Lov. 1640, 3 vols. fol., etc. On the external history of Jansenism (the bull *In Eminenti*, issued by Pope Urban VIII., A.D. 1642), as well as of *Jean du Vergier*, Abbot of St. Cyran and of Port-Royal des Champs, compare the works of *Reuchlin*, *Neale*, etc., and the works on Church history in general; as regards the scientific importance of the Society of Port-Royal, in its bearing upon France, see the works on the history of literature, especially: *Sainte-Beuve*, Port-Royal, 4 vols., Paris 1840–1858.

(3) Comp. above, § 84, 114. Jansenism may be called Protestantism within the Roman Catholic Church, so far as Jesuitism, which is its antithesis, represents modern Catholicism. But we ought to bear in mind that this can be said only in reference to the doctrines of grace and works. As regards the sacraments (and especially the Lord's Supper), the Jansenists have strictly retained the views of the Roman Catholic Church, and are quite as decidedly opposed to the Protestant doctrines as the Council of Trent, or the Catholicism of the Jesuits.

(4) *Arnauld* was born A.D. 1612, and died 1694. His complete works appeared after his death, Lausanne 1780, 4to.

Comp. *Reuchlin*, s. 132 ff., 206 ff. Kirchenhistor. Archiv, 1824, s. 101 ff. [The chief works of *Arnauld*, De la fréquente Communion, 1643; La Theologie Morale des Jesuites, 1643; Apologie de Jansen, 1644; Œuvres, 1648, 4to. He wrote against the Protestants (Jurien and Aubertin), the Jesuits (Maimbourg, Annat), and the philosophers (Descartes and Malebranche).]

(5) *Nicole* was born A.D. 1625, and died 1695. He opposed the Jesuits as well as the Protestants. Kirchenhist. Archiv, l.c. s. 121 ff. [Some of his works have been reprinted with Pascal's Pensées.]

(6) *Pascal* was born A.D. 1623, at Clermont in Auvergne, and died 1662. *He wrote:* Les Provinciales (Lettres écrites par Louis Montalte à un Provincial de ses amis.), Col. 1657. —Pensées sur la Religion, 1669. They were translated into German by *K. A. Blech*, with a preface by *Neander*, Berlin 1840. (Œuvres, Paris 1816.) Comp. the biography composed by his sister (*Mad. Périer*), and prefixed to his Pensées; *Théremin* (Adalberts Bekenntnisse, Berlin 1831), s. 222 ff. *J. Rust*, De Blasio Pascale, Erlang. 1833, 4to, and **Reuchlin*, Pascals Leben und der Geist seiner Schriften, Stuttg. 1840. [*Pascal's* Pensées, first published by *Périer*, imperfect and mutilated; also by *Condorcet*, 1776; *Voltaire*, 1778; revised by *Faugère*, after the original, 2 vols. 1844; and *Havet*, 1852, 2 vols. 8vo, and 1 vol. 12mo; and *Astié*, 2 vols., Lausanne 1857. *Molinier*, Paris 1878, 1879, 2 vols., in which the original spelling is retained. A complete ed. of P.'s works by Faugère announced. *A. Vinet*, Etudes sur Blaise Pascal, Paris 1848. *Neander*, Geschichtliche Bedeutung d. Pensées in his Wissenschaftliche Abhandlungen. Abbé *Maynard*, Les Provinciales et leur Refutation, 2 vols., Paris 1851.—An English transl. of the Provincial Letters, 2d ed. 1658, Lond.; also 1816. Thoughts, newly transl. ed. by *Bickersteth*, 1833. *M'Crie's* transl. of Letters, Edinb. Thoughts and Letters, etc., by *G. Pearce*, from the edition of Faugère, 3 vols., Lond. 1847–1850.]

(7) *Quesnel* [born 1634] died A.D. 1719. He published Le Nouveau Testament en français avec des réflexions morales, etc., Par. 1687, etc., 8 vols. On the controversies respecting the constitution of the Church, see the works on ecclesiastical

history. [The New Test. of Quesnel, with Moral Reflections, 4 vols., Lond. 1719–1725: his Four Gospels, edited by Bp. *D. Wilson*, in 3 vols.]

§ 229.

The Mysticism of the Roman Catholic Church.

Hamberger, Stimmen aus dem Heiligthum d. Christl. Mystik u. Theosophie, Stuttg. 1857. [*M. Jocham*, Lichtstrahlen aus den Schriften Katholischer mystiker, München 1876 (still in progress).]

Notwithstanding all the efforts made by Roman Catholics to obtain the ascendency in science, art, and politics (an attempt in which the Jesuits displayed the greatest activity), they never entirely lost that spiritual tendency which characterized the ecclesiastical mysticism of the Middle Ages. The most distinguished representatives of this tendency were the new saints, *Carlo Borromeo* (1), *François de Sales* (2), and others, together with Cardinal *Bona* (3). Nevertheless, mysticism here again showed a tendency to pantheism, as is evident in the case of the German mystic, *Angelus Silesius* (4). —The mystic quietism of *Michael Molinos* (5), a Spanish secular priest, formed a striking contrast to the intriguing worldliness of Jesuitism, and gave rise to the *Quietist* controversy in France (6). None but men of as pure a character as *Fénélon* (7), whose life was one of constant communion with God, could hold such a doctrine in its ideal aspect without exposing themselves to the danger of fanaticism, the bare possibility of which alarmed the sober intellect of *Bossuet* (8).

(1) *Borromeo* was born A.D. 1538, at Arona, and died 1584, as Archbishop of Milan. He was canonized 1610. Compare *†*Sailer*, Der heil. Karl Borromeus, Augsb. 1823. For his writings, which are chiefly ascetic, see ibid. s. 146, and s. 225 ff. (where passages from his homilies are given). [*Godeau*, La Vie de Ch. Borrom., Paris 1747. *Giussano*, Vita, and in Germ. by Klitsche.]

(2) *François de Sales* was born A.D. 1567, in Savoy, and

died 1622, as Bishop (in partibus) of Geneva. He was canonized 1665.—A new edition of his *works* appeared, Paris 1834, 16 vols.—Introduction à la vie dévote. [Transl. into Eng., several editions.] A memoir of his life was published by *Marsollier*, Paris 1747, 2 vols. Comp. *Sailer*, Briefe aus allen Jahrhunderten, Bd. iii. s. 127 ff. [*Baudry*, Supplement aux Œuvres de Franç. de Sales, Lyon 1836.]

(3) *Giovanni Bona* was born A.D. 1609, at Mondovi in Piedmont, entered the order of St. Bernard, was made cardinal 1669, and died 1674.—*He wrote:* Via Compendii ad Deum, Col. 1671.—Manuductio ad Cœlum, Par. 1664, etc. His works appeared Par. (Antv.) 1677, and Antv. 1739, fol. [Best ed. by *Sala*, Tur. 1747–1753, 3 vols. 4to. *Bona's* Guide to Eternity, transl. by *Sir R. L'Estrange*, 6th ed., Lond. 1712.]

(4) His proper name was *Scheffler*,[1] he was born A.D. 1624, at Breslau in Silesia, renounced Protestantism for the Roman Catholic Church 1653, and died 1677, in the monastery of the Jesuits at Breslau. *He wrote:* Heilige Seelenlust—Cherubinischer Wandersmann, etc. Extracts from his works are given by *Wackernagel*, Lesebuch, ii. sp. 427 ff.—*Varnhagen von Ense*, Denkwürdigkeiten und vermischte Schriften, 1837, i. s. 307 ff. **Göschel*, in the Jahrbücher für wiss. Kritik, 1834, Nr. 41 ff. *Wittmann*, Angelus Silesius, als Convertit, Myst. Dichter, und Polemiker, Augsb. 1842. *Kahlert*, Angelus Silesius, Bresl. 1853.

(5) *Molinos*, died A.D. 1696, after several years' imprisonment in Rome. On the question whether he stood in connection with the Alombrados, see *Baumgarten-Crusius*, Compend. i. s. 407. *He composed* a Guida spirituale, Rom. 1675. (It was translated into Latin by *A. H. Francke*, Lips. 1687.) *C. E. Scharling*, Michael de Molinos (from the Danish), Gotha 1855. [*Molinos'* Spiritual Guide, transl., Lond. 1688. Lettres écrites de Rome touchant l'affaire de Molin., Amst. 1696.] Other Spanish mystics prior to his time were: *Therese a Jesu* (who died A.D. 1582) and *Johannes a Cruce* (who died A.D. 1591, and was canonized 1726). *Lope de Vega*, died 1635. Comp. *Baumgarten-Crusius*, l.c. s. 410. *Hamberger*, s. 189 ff.

[1] *Schrader* objects to the identity of *Silesius* and *Scheffler*, in his work, Angelus Silesius in seiner Mystik, Halle 1853, 4to, but on insufficient grounds.

(6) The controversy was called forth by *Antoinette* [Jeanne] *Marie Bouvières* [Bouvier] *de la Mothe-Guyon* (who died A.D. 1717); see her Autobiography, Col. 1720, 3 vols., and the account of her life given by her confessor, *François la Combe*. On the controversy itself, see the works on ecclesiastical history, and the biography of Fénélon mentioned in the following note. [Life of Madame Guyon, by Prof. *T. C. Upham*, 2 vols. 1824. The complete works of *Madame Guyon* form 49 volumes.]

(7) *François de Salignac de la Mothe Fénélon* was born A.D. 1651, and died 1715, as Archbishop of Cambray. *He wrote:* Explication des maximes des Saints sur la vie intérieure, Par. 1697, Amst. 1698.—Œuvres Spirituelles, Amst. 1725, 5 vols. They were translated into German by *Claudius*, Hamb. 1823, 3 vols. A very full memoir of his life (in which an account of the whole controversy is given) is contained in the work of **Bausset*, Histoire de J. B. Bossuet, 4 vols., Vers. 1814, and *Herder*, Adrastea (Werke zur Philosophie, ix.), s. 43. See *G. W. Lechler* in *Herzog's* Realencyklop. iv. s. 356 ff., and comp. § 228, note 7. [*Fénélon*, Œuvres, 10 vols., Par. 1851. Transl. of Directions for Holy Life, 1747; Demonstration of Being of God, 1715; Pastoral Letter concerning Love of God, 1715; Part of his Spiritual Works by *R. Houghton*, 2 vols., Dubl. 1771; *De Bausset's* Life of F., transl. by *W. Mudford*, 2 vols., Lond. 1810.]

(8) See his Relation sur le Quiétisme, 1693.

On the different forms which the mysticism of the Roman Catholic Church assumes ("areopagitic, ascetic, speculative, and deeply religious"), see *Baumg.-Crus.* Comp. i. s. 409.

§ 230.

More Liberal Tendencies in Criticism and Systematic Theology. Transition to the following Period.

Though a system of liberal criticism in general was restrained by the very principle of Roman Catholicism, yet in respect to *biblical* literature the critical spirit was able to develope itself more freely in the Roman Church than in Protestant soil.

Thus *Richard Simon* laid the foundation of biblical criticism (1), and also contributed, by his doctrinal writings, to prepare the way for that new state of things which was to grow out of the conflicts of the most heterogeneous elements. About the same time *Jean Baptiste du Hamel* (2) and *Natalis Alexander* (3) were distinguished as theologians of a more liberal tendency, who endeavoured to throw off the yoke of scholasticism. [Comp. § 228, note 6.]

(1) *Simon* was born A.D. 1638, and died 1712. His *work* is entitled: Histoire Critique du Vieux Test., Rot. 1685, 4to, du N. T. 1689.

(2) *Du Hamel* was born A.D. 1624, officiated as priest of the Oratory, and died 1706. *He wrote:* Theol. Speculativa et Practica, Par. 1691. *Heinrich,* s. 382. *Schröckh,* vii. s. 208.

(3) *Noël Alexandre* was born A.D. 1639, and died 1724; he belonged to the order of the Dominicans, and was a learned monk. [He was condemned for his Gallicanism by Pope Innocent XI. 1684.] Besides his famous Hist. Eccles., best ed. 20 vols. 4to, by Romaglia and Mansi, 1785–1790, *he wrote:* Theologia Dogmatica et Moralis, Par. 1693, 10 vols. 1699, 1703. Dissertationes Historico-ecclesiasticæ, 2 vols. fol. (*Heinrich,* s. 384. *Schröckh,* l.c.)

IV. THE GREEK CHURCH.

§ 231.

While the very foundations of the Roman Catholic Church were shaken by the Reformation, which nevertheless exerted, in some respects, a reviving and regenerating influence upon it, the Greek Church presented the mournful aspect of a ruin in the midst of a Mahometan world. It came into contact with Protestantism, but only externally, and for a very short time (1). *Cyrillus Lucaris,* Patriarch of Constantinople, lost his life (A.D. 1638) in consequence of betraying a leaning toward Calvinism (2). Soon after (A.D. 1642), *Petrus Mogilas,*

Metropolitan of Kiew, together with some other Greek theologians, drew up a confession of faith for the Russians, which met with the approbation of the patriarchs of the East, and received (1672) the sanction of the Synod of Jerusalem. Though *Leo Allatius* (1669) endeavoured to prove the agreement between the doctrines of the Greek and the Roman Churches, the former continued to maintain its independence (3).

(1) A.D. 1559, Melanchthon transmitted a Greek translation of the Confessio Augustana to the patriarch Joseph II., but without results. Nor did the negotiations between the patriarch Jeremias II. (1574) on the one hand, and J. Andreä and the theologians of Tübingen on the other, lead to any more favourable result. The correspondence to which they gave rise was broken off A.D. 1581; see *Schnurrer*, De Actis inter Tub. Theoll. et Patriarchas Const. (Oratt. Acad. ed. *Paulus*, Tub. 1828).

(2) (*Λεύκαρις.*) *Ἀνατολικὴ ὁμολογία τῆς χριστιανικῆς πίστεως*, lat. Genev. 1629; Greek, 1633; Latin and Greek, 1645. It is given by *Aymon*, Monumens Authentiques de la Rel. des Grecs, etc., à la Haye, 1708, 4to; and by *Kimmel*, Libri Symbol. Eccl. Orient, p. 24 ss. See his Prolegomena, p. xxii. [On *Cyril Lucar*, see *Neale's* Holy Eastern Church, 4 vols. 1848–1850.]

(3) *Ἔκθεσις τῆς τῶν Ῥωσῶν πίστεως*, 1642; afterwards under the title: *Ὀρθόδοξος ὁμολογία τῆς καθολικῆς καὶ ἀποστολικῆς ἐκκλησίας ἀνατολικῆς*, in *Kimmel*, p. 45 ss., and Prolegomena, p. i. ss. Comp. Synodus Hierosolymitana adversus Calvinistas anno MDCLXXII. sub Patriarcha Hierosolymorum celebrata, in *Kimmel*, p. 325 ss., and Prolegomena, p. lxxv.

V. MINOR RELIGIOUS PARTIES (SECTS).

§ 232.

Conrad Schlüsselburg, Catalogus hæreticorum, Francof. 1697 ss., xiii. *Erbkam*, Geschichte der Protest. Secten im Zeitalter der Reformation, Hamb. 1848. **Matth. Schneckenburger*, Vorlesungen über die Lehrbegriffe der kleinern protestantischen Kirchenparteien, herausgeg. von *Hundeshagen*, Frankf. 1863.

While the Reformation was pursuing its work, various tendencies also manifested themselves in opposition to the existing Catholic Church, which we may in part regard as a continuation of an earlier unchurchly spirit of antagonism, and partly as the one-sided negative efforts of a narrow-minded criticism. Protestants could not make common cause with them without becoming disintegrated. On that account, Anabaptism and Unitarianism, which had already been rejected by the Catholic Church (though under different forms), met with an equally decisive opposition from the Lutherans and Reformed Protestants, and were accordingly stigmatized as sects. And, again, at a later period, several sects made their appearance, of which only a few, *e.g.* the Society of Friends, have prolonged their existence to the present time. On the other hand, the dogmatic rigorism of the Protestant Church might evoke a justifiable opposition, and compel the more moderate to build their chapel by the side of the church. This was the case with the Arminians (Remonstrants), who formed not so much a sect as a fraction of the Reformed Church.

§ 233.

(*a*) *Anabaptists* (*Mennonites*).

Schyn, Historia Christianorum, qui in Belgio Fœderato, Mennonitæ appellantur, Amst. 1723. *Hunzinger*, Das religiöse Kirchen- und Schulwesen der Mennoniten, Speier 1831. *Erbkam*, l.c. s. 480 ff. *Göbel*, Geschichte des Christl. Lebens in d. Rhein. Westph. Kirche, ii. s. 290 ff. For the rest of the literature, see the works on Church History. — *J. J. Van Oosterzee*, Menno Simonis u. die Mennoniten, in *Herzog's* Realencyklop. ix. s. 399 ff. *Nippold*, Die widerkirchliche Mystik in Reformationszeitalter, in *Gelzers* Monatsblättern, 1864. [Publications of Hansard Knollys Soc. England.]

Infant Baptism was at first opposed by rude enthusiasts and the promoters of revolution (1). But at a later period, about the middle of the sixteenth century, *Menno Simonis* (2), a native of Holland, succeeded in collecting those who held these views concerning baptism, and in constituting a regular communion, which took the name of *Mennonites*, and in the

course of time divided itself into several smaller bodies (3). The earliest confession of faith adopted by the Mennonites is that drawn up by *John Ris* and *Lübbert Gerardi*, about the year 1580 [1609] (4). Other confessions of faith do not enjoy such general authority among the adherents of this sect (5).

(1) On the first movements of the prophets of Zwickau (*Nicolas Storch, Martin Cellarius* [Borhaus], *Marx Stübner*, and *Thomas Münzer*) and of *Carlstadt*, as well as on the Anabaptists of Switzerland, and the negotiations with them (*Grebel, Manz, Hochrütener, Hubmeier*, and others); and also respecting the disturbances made by the Anabaptists of Münster (*Rottman, Bockhold, Knipperdölling*),—see the works on the History of the Reformation. On their doctrines (though from the polemical point of view), see *Melanchthon's* Vorlegung etlicher unchristlicher Artikel, welche die Wiedertäufer vorgeben, in the German works of *Luther*, Thl. ii. of the edition of Wittenberg, s. 282 ff. . . . *Justus Menius*, Der Wiedertäufer Lehre und Geheimniss aus heiliger Schrift widerlegt, ibid. s. 299 ff. —*Bullinger*, Von der Wiedertaufe Ursprung, Secten, und Wesen, Zür. 1561, 4to. *Ott*, Annales anabaptistici, Bas. 1624. Comp. the more recent literature. [*C. A. Cornelius*, Gesch. des münsterischen Aufruhrs, in 3 Büchern, i. 1855; ii. Die Wiedertaufe, 1860.] *Hast*, Gesch. Wiedertäufer, Münster 1836 ff. The remarkable mixture of (montanistic) fanaticism, transgressing the limits of Scripture, with narrow-minded adherence to the letter of Scripture, was already remarked upon by *Zwingli*; see his works (edited by *Schuler* and *Schulthess*), ii. 1, s. 298: "*Sometimes they insist upon taking the letter in its strict sense, without understanding it and without any interpretation; sometimes they wholly refuse to admit it.*" On *David Joris* and the Joristic sect, see *Nippold* in Niedner's Zeitschr. f. hist. Theol. 1864, 1 and 4.

(2) *Menno* was born A.D. 1505, and died 1561. The *fundamental principles* of Mennonitism are: The rejection of infant baptism, the refusal to take oaths and to serve in the army, and lastly, the rite of washing the feet.

(3) Waterlandians and Flamingians, the more refined and the more rude. Concerning their further gradations, and the

entire history of the sect and its spread, see the works on Church History.

(4) It appeared under the title: Korde Belydenisse des Geloofs, etc. Præcipuorum Christianæ Fidei Articulorum brevis Confessio, 1580. The Latin edition which is given by *Schyn*, l.c. c. 7, p. 172 ss., consists of forty articles. [On the Confessions of the English Baptists, see *Cutting*, ubi supra, and the work of *Underhill*, for Hansard Knollys Soc.]

(5) Comp. *Schyn*, l.c. *Köcher*, Bibl. Symb. p. 467 ss. *Winer*, s. 24 ff. (On their Catechisms, see ibid.)

§ 234.

(*b*) *Unitarians* (*Socinians*).

C. G. Sandii Bibliotheca Antitrinitariorum, Freist. (Amst.) 1684. · *F. S. Bock*, Historia Antitrinitariorum, maxime Socinianismi et Socinianorum, Regiomont 1774–1784. **Trechsel*, Die protestantischen Antitrinitarier vor Faustus Socinus. 1 Buch: Michael Servet und seine Vorgänger, Heidelb. 1839; 2 Buch: Lelio Socini und die Antitrinit. seiner Zeit, 1844. *O. Fock*, Der Socinianismus nach seiner Stellung in der Gesammtentwicklung des Christl. Geistes, nach seinem Verlauf, und nach seinem Lehrbegriffe, Kiel 1847. *Hilgenfeld*, Kritische Studien über den Socinianismus, in Zellers Jahrbücher, 1848, s. 371 ff. [*Dorner*, Lehre v. d. Person Christi, ii. 751 ff. *Th. Lindsey*, Hist. View of Unit. from the Reformation, Lond. 1783, and Mem. of L., by *Belsham*, Lond. 1812. *J. B. Beard*, Historical Illustrations of Trinity, Lond. 1846.] *Herzog* in his Realenc. xiv. s. 490 ff. *Schneckenburger*, l.c. (§ 232).

While infant baptism and other doctrines were opposed on practical grounds, the ecclesiastical doctrine of the Trinity was, about the same time, attacked from the theoretical point of view, so that the history of the first Unitarians, from the period of the Reformation, appears in many aspects entangled with that of the Anabaptists (1). The violent persecution, by which both Roman Catholics and Protestants endeavoured to suppress Unitarianism (2), most marked in the execution of *Michael Servetus* (3), could not prevent the formation of a sect (4), which maintained that a plurality of persons in the divine nature could not be proved from the Scripture, though they acknowledged that it contained a divine revelation, and

professed all reverence for the human person of Christ. By the labours of *Lælius Socinus* (5), and still more of his nephew *Faustus Socinus* (6), the scattered Unitarian party were united into a distinct Church organization, and adopted the name of *Socinians*. The one-sided rationalistic tendency of Socinianism included the germs both of later Rationalism (negatively), and of a merely external biblical Supernaturalism (positively), and thus contributed to the transition from the one period to the other (7). The appellation *Racovienses*, which is also applied to the Socinians, as well as the name of their catechism, Catechismus Racoviensis, were derived from the Polish town Rakow (8). Besides the authors of that catechism, the following theologians more fully developed the Socinian doctrine, viz. *Jonas Schlichting*, *J. Völkel*, *Joh.* and *Samuel Crell*, *Christian Ostorodt*, *Valentin Schmalz*, *Ludwig Wolzogen*, *Andreas Wissowatius*, and others (9). [The controversy passed over into England, where it was continued by Bishop *Bull* (10), and especially by *Clarke* and *Waterland* in the early part of the eighteenth century (11).]

(1) "*That which the Anabaptists attempted in reference to the Church and to practical religion, other theologians, of a tendency closely allied to it, and largely impregnated with Anabaptist elements, sought to accomplish in reference to theology. The latter tendency was, properly speaking, only a distinct branch of the former, and a particular form and expression of the same general movement*," *Trechsel*, l.c. s. 8. What was said, § 232, of the one-sided rationalistic system of criticism (which apparently forms a *contrast* to the fanaticism of the Anabaptists) has primary reference to the later development of Unitarianism by Socinus. Comp. note 7, and *Trechsel*, s. 3 and 4. *Baumgarten-Crusius* (Compend. i. s. 332 f.) also sees in the Antitrinitarians the speculative opposition, in the Anabaptists the practical one.

(2) Among the earlier Antitrinitarians we may mention: *Ludwig Hetzer* of Bischofszell in Thurgau (Switzerland); he was executed at Constance A.D. 1529; *Johann Denck*, a native of the Upper Palatinate. [On *Denck* and *Hetzer*, see *Herzog's*

Realencyklop. s.v.] *Jacob Kautz* of Bockenheim; *Conrad in Gassen*, a native of Würtemberg (he was beheaded at Basel A.D. 1529); *Johannes Campanus*, a native of the Netherlands, who was professor in the University of Wittenberg; *Melchior Hofmann*, at Strassburg; *Adam Pistorius* and *Rudolph Martini*, both natives of Westphalia; *David Joris* of Bruges, an Anabaptist, and *Claudius of Savoy*. On their doctrines, in which they widely differed, inasmuch as some adopted the notions of Arius, others those of Sabellius, or of Paul of Samosata, compare *Trechsel*, l.c. (Section i.), and the Special History of Doctrines. *John Valdez*, a Spaniard, who died A.D. 1540, at Naples, is also numbered by some writers, not only among the promoters of the Reformation, but also among the forerunners of Unitarianism; on the other side, comp. *Sandius*, l.c. 2–6, and *C. Schmid*, in Illgens Zeitschrift für hist. Theol. i. 4, s. 837.

(3) *Servetus*, surnamed *Reves*, was born A.D. 1509, or 1511, at Villanueva, in the kingdom of Aragon; accompanied the Emperor Charles v. on his expedition to Italy (1529), took up his residence in Basel 1530 (with Œcolampadius), and wrote (1531) his work entitled: De Trinitatis Erroribus, libri vii. Afterwards he resided several times in France, etc. His trial and execution took place at Geneva A.D. 1553. On the history of his life, see *Mosheim*, Neue Nachrichten von dem berühmten Span. Arzte, Michael Serveto, Helmst. 1756, 4to, and *Trechsel*, l.c. [On *Servetus*, see *Henry*, Leben Calvin's, iii. 95; *D. R. Willis*, Calvin and Servetus, a Study, etc., Lond. 1877.]

(4) To this sect belonged also *Joh. Valentin Gentilis* (he was beheaded at Bern A.D. 1566), *Paul Alciat* (who died at Danzig 1565), *Matthäus Gribaldi* (died 1564, in Savoy), *Georg Blandrata* (who lived in Poland and Transylvania, and died 1590), and in some measure (?) *Bernhard Ochino* (he died 1564, in Moravia), *Cœlius Sec. Curio* (he died 1569), *Paul Vergerius* (he died 1565), and several others. From the middle of the sixteenth century Antitrinitarian principles were chiefly spread in Poland. The Socinians formed themselves into a distinct ecclesiastical body at the Synods of Pinczow and Petrikow (1563–1565).

(5) *Lælius Socinus* (Lelio Sozzini) was born at Siena A.D.

1525, and died 1562.—See *C. F. Illgen*, Vita Lælii Socini, Lips. 1814. *J. C. Orelli*, Lælius Socinus in the Basler Wiss. Zeitschrift, Jahrg. 1824, Heft 3, s. 28 ff., and the requisite documents, ibid. s. 138 ff.

(6) *Faustus Socinus* (Fausto Sozzini), nephew of Lælius, was born [also at Siena] A.D. 1539, and died 1604. Comp. the memoir of his life by *Przypcovius* (Przypkowski) in Bibliotheca Fratrum Polonorum (note 9), P. i. He chiefly laboured in Poland and Transylvania. *Baumgarten-Crusius* justly designates Lælius Socinus "*the spiritual father of Socinianism*," and Faustus Socinus "*the founder of the sect.*" Compend. i. s. 334. [*He wrote:* Auctoritates sacræ scripturæ, 1558; De Jesu Christo Servatore, 1594.]

(7) "*We may call Socinianism the common birth-place at once of the Supranaturalism and the Rationalism of modern Protestant theology*," *Strauss*, Christliche Glaubenslehre, i. s. 56.

(8) An older Catechism was composed by *Georg Schomann*, a Socinian minister in Cracow, who died A.D. 1591. It was followed by that of F. Socinus, which appeared under the title: Christianæ Religionis brevissima Institutio per interrogationes et responsiones, quam Catechismum vulgo vocant, Racov. 1618. (It was incomplete, inasmuch as it includes only theology and christology.) It formed the basis of the larger Socinian catechism, which was composed by *Hieron. Moscorovius*, a Polish nobleman, who died 1625, and *Valentin Schmalz*, a Socinian minister, and published 1605, in the Polish language. It was translated into Latin under the title: Catechesis Ecclesiarum, quæ in regno Polon. et magno ducatu Lithuaniæ et aliis ad istud regnum pertinentibus provinciis affirmant, neminem alium præter patrem Domini nostri J. C. esse illum unum Deum Israelis, hominem autem illum, Jesum Naz., qui ex virgine natus est, nec alium præter aut ante ipsum, Dei filium unigenitum et agnoscunt et confitentur, Racov. 1609.—A new edition, with a refutation, was published by *G. L. Oeder*, Frankf. and Leipz. 1739; here the questions are for the first time numbered. [This Catechism was ordered to be burnt by the Parliament of England in 1652. It was translated, with notes and illustrations, and a Sketch of the History of Unitarianism, by *Thos. Rees*, Lond.

1818.] Concerning other editions, which also contain other confessions of faith adopted by the Socinians (the Confessio Fidei by *Joh. Schlichting*, 1646), comp. *Winer*, s. 25 f.

(9) Their writings are collected in the Bibliotheca Fratrum Polonorum, quos Unitarios vocant, Irenop. (Amst.) 1656, 6 vols. fol. For further particulars, see *Winer*, s. 27.

(10) [Bp. *Bull's* (see § 225*b*) Defensio Fidei Nicæn. was published in 1685 (written several years previous, but could not find a publisher), and was directed against *Sandius* (a Socinian, died at Amst. 1680), author of Nucleus Hist. Eccles. exhibitus in Hist. Arian., and collector of the Bibliotheca Anti-Trinitar.]

(11) [*Samuel Clarke's* (see § 225*b*) Scripture Doctrine of the Trinity was published in 1712 (see fourth vol. of his Works). It was answered by Dr. *Wells*, 1713, *Nelson*, and Dr. *John Edwards* (who also opposed Bull's subordination scheme). —In 1719, Dr. *Daniel Waterland* published his Vindication of Christ's Divinity, a Defence of some Queries (1726) in relation to Clarke's scheme, in answer to Jackson (born 1686, died 1763), and a second Vindication in 1732; and a further Vindication 1734 (Works, vol. i.–iii.).]

§ 235.

(*c*) *Arminians* (*Remonstrants*).

Regenboog, Historie der Remonstranten, transl. from the Dutch, Lemgo 1781. **Abr. des Amorie van der Hœven*, Het tweede Eeuwfest van het Seminarium der Remonstranten, Leeuwarden 1830. [Article Arminius, by *Pelt* in *Herzog's* Realenc. Comp. *Motley's* John of Barneveld, Lond. 2 vols.]

Excluded from the Reformed Church on account of their more moderate views on Election, the *Arminians* found themselves compelled to form a distinct religious community (1), the principles of which are contained both in the Five Articles of the Remonstrants (A.D. 1610) (2), and in the confession of faith drawn up by *Simon Episcopius* (3). Arminianism is characterized not only by holding to the universality of the provision for redemption, but also by a

kind of moderate orthodoxy, almost imperceptibly commingled with heterodox elements, and has chief respect to the moral rather than the rigid dogmatic element. As regards its tendency, it is in some respects allied to the sober common sense of Socinianism, but it has, at the same time, preserved a sufficient amount of positive religion to oppose the special negative doctrines of that creed. Next to *Arminius* himself and *Simon Episcopius*, *Hugo Grotius* (4) and *Philip a Limborch* (5) were the most distinguished of the Arminian theologians; the former in his philosophico-apologetic and exegetical writings, the latter in his doctrinal works. The Arminian Church numbered also among its members many eminent men (6), who exerted a beneficial reaction upon Protestantism by their thorough scientific attainments no less than by the mildness of their sentiments (7).

(1) *Arminius* (Harmsen, or Hermann) was born A.D. 1560, at Oudwater, taught from the year 1603 theology in the University of Leyden, and died 1609. His theological works were published, Lugd. Bat. 1629, 4to. On the controversy between him and his colleague, *Gomarus*, and its consequences, see later works on church history. [Life of Arminius, by *Brandt*, transl. by *John Guthrie*, Lond. 1855. Works of *Arminius*, transl. by *Jas. Nichols*, Lond. 3 vols.—*Francis Gomarus*, the chief opponent of Arminius, born 1563, prof. Leyden 1594, at Saumur 1614, at Groningen 1618, died 1641; Opera Theol., 2d ed., Amst. 1664.] See *Pelt* in *Herzog*.

(2) They were presented to the States of Holland and West Friesland under the title: Remonstrantia, Libellus Supplex exhibitus Hollandiæ et Westfrisiæ Ordinibus: they are reprinted in *Walch*, Religionsstreitigkeiten ausser der lutherischen Kirche, iii. s. 540 ff.

(3) *Simon Episcopius* (Biscop) was born A.D. 1583, and died 1643. Confessio seu Declaratio Sententiæ Pastorum, qui in fœderato Belgio Remonstrantes vocantur, super præcipuis Articulis Relig. Christ., Harderov. 1622, 4to (in *Sim. Episc.* Opp. ii. 2, p. 69 ss.). It consists of 25 chapters. Concerning the different editions and translations of that confession, see *Clarisse*,

Encycl. Theol. p. 443, and *Winer*, s. 23.—Episcopius wrote his Apologia pro Confessione, etc., 1629 (1630 ?), 4to (Opp. p. 95 ss.), in reply to the Censura in Confess. Remonstr. (Lugd. Bat. 1626), composed by *J. Polyander*, *Andreas Rivetus*, *Antonius Walæus*, and *Antonius Thysius*, all of them professors in the University of Leyden. As regards several other controversial matters, comp. *Episcopii* Verus Theologus Remonstrans, ibid. p. 208 ss. In addition, Episcopius *wrote* Institutiones Theologicæ, libri iv.; incomplete; vol. i. of Opp. (Amst. 1650, 1665, 2 vols. fol.). On the catechisms composed by *John Uytenbogard* and *Bartholomaeus Praevostius*, see *Winer*, l.c. *Heppe* in Herzog's Realencyclop. iv. s. 100. [Comp. *Limborch*, Vita Episcopii, Amst. 1701.]

(4) *Grotius* (Van Groot) was born A.D. 1583, and died 1645. To clear himself from the suspicion of Socinianism, he wrote his Defensio Fidei Catholicæ de Satisfactione Christi, 1617.—De Veritate Rel. Christ., Lugd. Bat. 1627.—Opp. Theol., Amst. 1679, 3 vols. fol., 1697, 4 vols. fol., Bas. 1731, 4 vols. fol. (the three first volumes contain writings of an exegetical character). See **Luden*, Hugo Grotius nach seinen Schicksalen und Schriften, Berlin 1806. [Opera, Lond. 3 vols., in 4 vols. fol. 1679. Truth of Christ. Relig., transl. by John Clarke, Lond. 1793, 1860. Life, by *C. Butler*, Lond. 1826. Comp. *Motley*, l.c. vol. ii.]

(5) *Philip van Limborch* was born A.D. 1633, professor in the Gymnasium of the Remonstrants at Amsterdam 1668, died 1712. His Theologia Christiana appeared Amst. 1686, Basil. 1735, fol. "*The most complete exposition of the Arminian doctrine is the celebrated work by Philip van Limborch, . . . a man distinguished for genius, learning, and modesty, whose literary labours are of great value. The very arrangement of his system displays originality. . . . Admirable perspicuity and judicious selection of the material characterize the entire work*," *Stäudlin*, Geschichte der theologischen Wissenschaften, i. s. 319. [*Limborch's* Complete System or Body of Divinity, transl. by *Wm. Jones*, 2 vols., Lond. 1702.]

(6) The following were distinguished writers on dogmatic theology: *Stephen Curcellæus*, the successor of Episcopius; he was born A.D. 1586, and died 1659. *He wrote:* Institutio Relig. Christ., Libb. vii. in Opp. Theol., Amst. 1675, fol. (in-

complete).—*Andr. a Cattenburgh* was born 1664, and died 1743. *He wrote:* Spicilegium Theol. Christ. Philippi a Limborch, Amst. 1726 f.—Bibl. Scriptor. Remonstrantium. [*John le Clerc,* born at Geneva 1657, died 1736, a universal scholar. Account of his Life and Writings, Lond. 1712. Vetus Test., 4 vols. fol., Amst. 1710; New Test. 1799; Of Incredulity, transl., Lond. 1697; Bibliothèque Universelle et Test., 26 vols., Amst. 1686–1693. Bibl. choisie, 28 vols. 1703–1713; Bibl. Ancienne et Moderne, 29 vols. 1714–1727.]

(7) "*The Arminian principle, which renounced the authority of the symbolical books, gave such an impulse to exegetical investigations, to independent hermeneutical labours, and to the speculative treatment of theology, that in consequence of the influence exerted by the works of Episcopius and Hugo Grotius, it was extended to the whole Evangelical Church. Thus a general desire manifested itself in the Protestant Church in Germany to do away with the authority of the symbolical books.*" *Schleiermacher,* Kg. s. 620. Comp. *Gass,* s. 435: "*The Arminian divines constantly make a discount upon the dogmas, and introduce milder features into the hard stamp of their doctrinal system, and so keep up a moderate or abbreviated orthodoxy, no longer confined to the symbolical books, and which is, by way of contrast, to be supported by practical piety and moral zeal.*"

§ 236.

(*d*) *Quakers.*

H. Croesii Historia Quakeriana, Amst. 1695, ed. 2, 1703. Quäkerhistorie, Berlin, 1696. *W. Sewel,* Geschichte von dem Ursprunge des christlichen Volkes, so Quaker genannt werden [from the English, publ. fol., Lond. 1722]. *H. Tuke,* Die Religionsgrundsätze, zu welchen die Gesellschaft der Quaker sich bekennt. Transl. from the English (1814), Leipz. 1828. *J. J. Gurney,* Observations on the Peculiarities of the Society of Friends, Lond. 1824. [*Penn,* Summary of the History, Doctrines, and Discipline of the Society of Friends, Lond. 1694, ed. 6, 1707. *Rowantree* and *Hancock,* Prize Essays on the Causes of the Decline of Quakerism, 1859, 1860.] *Lods,* Etude historique et critique sur le Quakerisme, 1857. *Herzog* in his Realenc. xii. s. 404 ff.

The principles of the Quakers are in some points allied with those of the Anabaptists (as regards, *e.g.,* the relation of

the internal to the external word, etc.). After the fire of enthusiasm kindled by *George Fox* (1), the founder of this sect, had gradually subsided, the Society of Friends, under their leader, *William Penn* (2), obtained (A.D. 1689) the confidence of the English government. But it was especially in the United States of North America (Pennsylvania) that this sect gained numerous adherents (3), though it also spread in other countries. *Robert Barclay*, a Scotchman, set forth their doctrines, if we may so term them, in a scientific form, and drew up a confession of faith (4).

(1) *Fox* was a shoemaker, born at Drayton, in the county of Leicester, in 1624, held fanatical notions, and died 1691. He founded the Society of Friends (to whom the nickname Quaker was given) A.D. 1649, amid the commotions of the English Revolution. [Life of Fox, by *J. S. Watson*, Lond. 1860.]

(2) *Penn* was the son of the celebrated admiral of the same name, born in London 1644, entertained more moderate opinions than Fox, died A.D. 1718. See the memoirs of his life by *Marsillac*, Par. 1791, transl. into German, Strassb. 1793. *Th. Clarkson*, Memoirs of the Private and Public Life of W. Penn, Lond. 1813, 2 vols. *Penn* himself *wrote:* A Summary of the History, Doctrine, and Discipline of Friends, ed. 6, Lond. 1707 (transl. into German by *Seebohm*, Pyrmont 1792). [Works, 2 vols. fol., 1726. *No Cross, no Crown, many edd. *W. H. Dixon*, William Penn, an historical Biog., with a chapter on the Macaulay Charges, Lond. 1851, new ed. 1856. *Geo. Bancroft*, Hist. United States, vol. ii. chap. xvi.]

(3) Their first settlement in the United States took place A.D. 1681. From the year 1686 they enjoyed toleration in England. But it was not till the eighteenth century that they gained any adherents on the Continent (the community existing in Pyrmont was founded 1791). See *Ludw. Seebohm*, Kurze Nachr. von dem Entstehen und dem Fortgang der christlichen Gesellschaft der Freunde, Pyrmont 1792.

(4) 1. Theologiæ veræ Christianæ Apologia, Amst. 1676, 4to. German translations of it appeared 1648, 1740. Writ-

ings in opposition to it, by *Anton Reiser, Barthold Holzfuss, Benr. Figken, Wilh. Baier*, provoked a vindication from Barclay. 2. Catechismus et Fidei Confessio approbata et confirmata communi Consensu et Consilio Patriarcharum, Prophetarum, et Apostolorum, Christo ipso inter eos præsidente et prosequente, Rot. 1676. Originally written in English (all made up of Bible texts). Collective edition of Barclay's works, by *W. Penn*, 1692. [*Robert Barclay*, born 1648, died 1690. See the article in *Allibone's* Dict. of Authors. His first work, 1670, Truth Cleared of Calumnies (against *William Mitchell*). His chief work, An Apology for the True Christ. Divinity, 1676, on the basis of Theses Theologicæ, previously propounded and sent to all parts. Frequently reprinted and translated into most of the languages of Europe.]

§ 237.

Attempts at Union (Syncretism).

C. W. Hering, Geschichte der kirchlichen Unionsversuche, seit der Reformation bis auf unsere Zeit, Leipz. 1836–1838, 2 vols. *H. Schmid*, Gesch. der synkretistischen Streitigkeiten in der Zeit des Calixt, Erlang. 1846. *W. Gass*, Georg Calixt u. der Synkretismus, Dogmen-hist. Abhandl., Breslau 1846. *Heppe*, Die altprotestantische Union (Confessionelle Entwicklung), s. 252 ff. [*E. L. Th. Henke*, Georg Calixtus und seine Zeit, Halle 1853–1860, 2 vols.]

Though the different religious parties were at that time strongly opposed to each other, there were, nevertheless, attempts to effect a union between the Lutherans and the Reformed (1) on the one side, and between Protestants and Roman Catholics on the other (2). These efforts tended to relax the stiffness of dogmas, but also to emasculate what was characteristic in them. The sects, too, exerted a reacting influence on the greater ecclesiastical bodies, since the mystics, who still adhered to the Church, agreed in essential points with the Anabaptists and Quakers (3). Arminianism and even Socinianism so influenced sober common-sense theologians, that they became favourable to greater concessions (4).

(1) As early as the time of the conflicts to which the Reformation gave rise, *Martin Bucer* and *Philip Landgrave of Hessen* endeavoured to exorcise the demon of dissension. From the Lutheran side, *Calixt* endeavoured, in the course of the seventeenth century, to reconcile the separate parties, and thus gave rise to what is called the Syncretistic controversy; from the Reformed side, *John Durœus*, a Scotchman, laboured from the year 1630 for the same object. [*Dury* died in 1680, in Cassel; from 1626 he was preacher to the Puritan colony at Elbing in Prussia. *He wrote:* Consultatio Theologica super Negotio Pacis Eccles., Lond. 1641.] The Conference of Leipzig, A.D. 1631. The Conference of Thorn, 1648. (Colloquium charitativum.)

(2) *Bossuet* (see § 227, note 14). *Rojas* (or Roxas) *de Spinola* (Bishop of Tina in Croatia from the year 1668, and Bishop of Wienerisch-Neustadt from the year 1685; he died 1695) entered into negotiations with *Molanus*, Abbot of Loccum in Hanover. *Leibnitz* took part in the negotiations. [*Molanus* was overseer of church affairs in Brunswick and Hanover; his project, Regulæ circa Christianorum omnium ecclesiasticam Reunionem, was published in 1691; his Cogitationes Privatæ, on the basis of Cassander, Grotius, and Spinola, 1691. *Bossuet* wrote De Scripto cui titulus, "Cogit. Privat." Episcopi Meldensis, 1692; *Molanus*, Explicatio Ulterior, 1692. *Leibnitz*, Correspondence with Paul Pelisson, Mdme. de Brinon and Bossuet, 1691–1694, 1699–1701 (Opera, ed. *Duten*, i. 507–537); see also Œuvres de Leibnitz, publiées pour la première fois d'apres les manuscrits originaux, par *A. Foucher de Careil*, Paris, tom. i. ii. 1859, 1860.]

(3) Especially in the doctrines concerning internal revelation, justification, etc. (thus they contributed at least to modify the direct opposition to the Romish Church).

(4) Comp. § 235, note 7.

§ 238.

Influence of Philosophy. Deism. Apologetics.

Carrière, Die philos. Weltanschauung der Reformationszeit, Stuttg. 1847. *C. Hagen*, Der Geist der Reformation und seine Gegensätze, 2 vols., Erlang. 1843, 1844. *John Leland*, A view of the principal deistical writers that

have appeared in England in the last and present century, 1754, 2 vols. [new ed., Appendix by *W. L. Brown*, and Introduction by *C. R. Edmonds*, Lond. 1837]. *Thorschmidt*, Freidenkerbibliothek, Halle 1765–1767. *Herder*, Adrastea (Werke zur Philosophie und Geschichte, ix.). **Goth. Vict. Lechler*, Geschichte des englischen Deismus, Stuttg. 1841.

Lastly, the religious parties, though divided on so many points, could make common cause in the contest for *Christianity* in general, against a tendency which either renounced the positive authority of revelation, or threatened it in essential relations. As early as the century of the Reformation, a theory of the universe was espoused, now in a deistic, and again in a pantheistic form, especially in Italy, which threatened to become dangerous to the Christian faith in a revelation, as held by Roman Catholics as well as Protestants (1). Theological science, however, was for the most part unaffected by these tendencies, and even the systems of the schools of the seventeenth century, which attained a more definite shape, had, with the exception of the Cartesian philosophy, no particular influence upon the shaping of the Christian dogma, toward which they assumed as far as possible the attitude of neutrality (2). Towards the end of the period (making a transition to the next) a popular form of philosophy, the so-called philosophy of common sense, made open war against the Christian system. Its advocates are generally known under the name of Freethinkers, Deists, or Naturalists. Aiming at practical results, with bold and hasty judgments, they declared war against the belief in revelation adopted by all the confessions (3), and thus called the slumbering apologists of the Christian Church to re-enter the lists (4).

(1) "*In the history of the world there are four successive periods, in which open unbelief, and unconcealed enmity to Christianity, went the rounds (so to speak) among the chief nations of Europe. These tendencies originated in the higher spheres of society, and pressed down into the middle class, and were cherished and extolled in both as the height of culture.*

Italy made the beginning in the fifteenth and sixteenth century; England and France followed in the seventeenth and eighteenth; the series closes in Germany in the nineteenth," Der deutsche Protestantismus, s. 53.—Among the philosophers of Italy, the most noted were *Girolamo Cerdano,* born 1501, died 1576; *Bernardino Telesio,* born 1508, died 1588, "the forerunner of the French sensationalism;" *Giordano Bruno,* burnt at Rome, Feb. 17, 1600. *Julius Cæsar Vanini,* born 1585, executed "as an atheist and blasphemer" at Toulouse, Feb. 9, 1619; *Tomaso Campanella,* born 1568, died 1639. The position assumed by these men towards Christianity was, however, different in different instances; some of them retained its positive, particularly its mystical, elements; others, Vanini in particular, were sceptical even to blasphemy. See *Carrière,* l.c.

(2) *Cartesianism,* almost alone, exerted a more direct influence upon the theology of the *present* period, and, in the first instance, only upon that of the Reformed Church (see § 225, note 1); *Malebranche,* however, introduced this philosophy also into the theology of the Roman Church. *Spinoza* (born A.D. 1632, died 1677), a man of elevated character, stood aloof from all ecclesiastical connections, on which account the theologians of his age took no notice of him. It was not till after his death that the speculative writers on Christian theology turned their attention to his system. *Locke* (born A.D. 1632, died 1704) promoted the interests of the empirical system, which was first established by Francis Bacon of Verulam (who died A.D. 1626), and in its turn contributed to the development of Deism (though in opposition to the intention of the author). *Leibnitz* (born 1646, died 1716) interested himself much in theology, as may be seen from his work on Theodicy, and the part he took in the attempts at union (see § 237). See *Pertz,* Ueber Leibnitzens Biblisches Glaubensbekenntniss, Berlin 1846. But it was not till *Wolf* remodelled his philosophy (in the following period) that it attracted the attention of theologians, and was introduced into their writings. For further details respecting the relation of philosophy to theology within the orthodox ecclesiastical doctrinal system, see *Gass,* s. 178 ff.

(3) On the vagueness of these appellations, see *Herder,* l.c.

s. 174 f. *Lechler*, s. 452 ff.[1] The so-called Deists differed widely among themselves in character, spirit, and sentiment,[2] and an equal difference may be observed in the relation in which their systems stand, both to each other and to Christianity. The Deism of England can only be explained in connection with the history of the English Reformation, and the conflicts to which it gave rise. Among its promoters, in addition to the sect of the *Seekers* and *Rationalists* (*Lechler*, s. 61, note), were the following writers: *Herbert* of Cherbury (died 1648), *Thomas Hobbes* (born 1588, died 1679, at the age of 91), *Charles Blount* (died 1693), *John Toland* (died 1722), *Anthony Collins* (died 1729), *Anthony Ashley Cooper* (Earl of Shaftesbury, died 1713), *Thomas Woolston* (died 1733), *Matthew Tindal* (died 1733), *Thomas Chubb* (*an illiterate person*, a glover and chandler, died 1747), and several others who lived in the following period. In France, *Jean Bodin* (died 1596, author of the Heptaplomeres, published by *Guhrauer*, 1841). *Michael de Montaigne* [died 1592; his Essais, published by *L'Angelier*, Paris 1595; best edition by *Pierre Coste*, 3 vols. 4to, Lond. 1724; complete works, transl. by Hazlitt, Lond. 1840] and *Pierre Charron* (died 1603) manifested a sceptical tendency; in later times, *Pierre Bayle* (died 1706) prepared the way for French Naturalism; concerning him, see *L. Feuerbach*, Pierre Bayle, Anspach 1838. [*Bayle's* Dict., transl. into English, 4 vols. fol. 1710; 5 vols. fol. 1734–1737.] In Germany, *Matthias Knutsen* (who lived about the year 1674) founded the sect of the "Gewissener," *Conscientiarii*.

(4) *Grotius* composed his apologetical work (§ 235, note 4) without reference to Deism. *Robert Boyle* (1638) endowed a series of lectures for the special purpose of opposing the English Deists. Among the English apologists, the most distinguished were *Richard Baxter* (died 1691), *William Sherlock* (died 1707), and others. On their polemical writings in

[1] The term "Deism," in particular, is not to be confounded with the same term as used by philosophers in distinction from Theism; for even Pantheism could ally itself with this tendency in its denial of Revelation.

[2] The author of the work, Der deutsche Protestantismus, justly calls attention to the preponderance of an idealistic and spiritualizing philosophy, as a characteristic of the English Deism, and to its honourable moral earnestness, in contrast with the frivolity of the later French materialism.

refutation of the Deists, see *Lechler*, l.c. Among the French apologists we may mention *Pascal* (see § 228, note 6), and *Abbadie*, a member of the Reformed Church (died 1727), who wrote: Traité de la Vérité de la Religion Chrétienne, Rotterd. 1684.

§ 238*a*.

[*The English Deism.*]

[Bp. *W. Van Mildert*, Rise and Progress of Infidelity; Boyle Lectures, 1802–1804, 2 vols., Oxf. 1838. *Mark Pattison*, in Essays and Reviews. *C. F. A. Kahnis*, Der innere Gang des deutschen Protestantismus, Leipz. 1854 (var. edd.). In Eng., Edinb. 1856.]

[Rationalism, in the form of Deism, was first systematically set forth in England. Its fundamental principle was, that reason is the source and measure of truth. Of Christianity it adopted only those truths which could be considered as a product of the light of nature; rejecting all that was miraculous, supernatural, or mysterious. Acknowledging a God, it denied a supernatural revelation. This tendency was stimulated in England by the conflicts of religious parties, and the prevalent freedom of thought and inquiry, by a reaction against the high church claims then put forth, and also by the progress of the empirical philosophy, as represented by some of the interpreters of *Bacon* (1) and *Locke* (2), and in the writings of *Hobbes* (3). The first of the avowed Deists was *Edward Herbert, Lord Cherbury* (4), who reduced religion to the most general truths of a system of natural ethics. *Charles Blount* (5) was a follower of Hobbes. Locke's thesis of the Reasonableness of Christianity was perverted by *John Toland* (6) into the position that Christianity is not mysterious, admitting in the New Testament only what is comprehensible by reason. *Anthony Collins* (7) continued the warfare in his Discourse on Free Thinking (1713), and his Discourse on the Grounds and Reasons of the Christian Religion (1725), to which thirty-five replies were published. *Thomas Woolston* (8) attacked the

Miracles of the Scripture (1727–1730). At the close of this period *Matthew Tindal* (9) gave a summary of the principles of Deism, in his Christianity as old as the Creation. Somewhat later *Thomas Chubb* and *Thomas Morgan* continued the succession of deistic writers (10), which ended with *Lord Bolingbroke* (see § 275). Deism passed over into scepticism; the moral principles of the school were represented in a more refined form by *Anthony Ashley Cooper* (11), Earl of Shaftesbury, and in a grosser manner by *Mandeville* (12), in his Fable of the Bees, presented as a nuisance by the grand jury in 1723.]

[Among the ablest defenders of the Christian system against these assaults were *Richard Bentley* in his Boyle Lectures, and in his reply to Collins; *Richard Baxter, S. Clarke, Sherlock,* in reply to Woolston; the dissenter *James Foster* (13), and *Bishop Stillingfleet; Bishop Butler* in his admirable Analogy, and many others (14).]

(1) [*Francis Bacon,* Baron of Verulam, born 1561, died 1626. Works, by *Basil Montagu,* 16 vols., Lond. 1825–1834; new edition, with Life and Letters, by *Spedding and Ellis,* Lond. 1857 ff. (The Advancement of Learning, 1605; Essays, 1597–1624; Novum Organum, 1620; De Augmentis Scient. 1624.) *G. L. Craik,* Bacon and his writings, new ed., 1860. Controversy between *Spedding* and *Abbott* in Contemp. Review. The philosophy of Bacon was expounded by the French school, in a spirit foreign to that of its author, applying its principles of induction to the supernatural as well as the natural sphere. His real spirit is expressed in the petition contained in the Preface to the Instauratio Magna: "We suppliantly beseech, that things human may not injure things divine; and that nothing of darkness and unbelief, with reference to the divine mysteries, may arise in our minds from the unlocking of the road for the senses, and the greater enkindling of natural light."]

(2) [*John Locke,* born 1632, died 1704. Works, 3 vols. fol. 1714, and often. Life, by *Lord King,* 2d ed. 2 vols., Lond. 1830; and by *Fox Bourne,* 1878, 2 vols. Essay on

the Human Understanding, 1690. His Reasonableness of Christianity (1695) gave the tone to the apologetic literature of the period. Comp. § 237, note 2.]

(3) [*Thomas Hobbes* of Malmesbury, born 1588, died 1679. Works, by *Sir Wm. Molesworth*, Lond. 1839–1855, 16 vols. (Leviathan, 1651; Tripos; on Liberty and Necessity, 1654). He was opposed by *Cudworth*, in his Intel. System; by Bp. *Bramhall*, on Necessity, and Catching the Leviathan, 1658; by *Lord Clarendon*, in his Survey of the Leviathan. Though reckoned among the deists, his principles subverted the basis of morality as well as religion, substituting external authority for moral obligation.]

(4) [*Edward Herbert*, Lord Herbert of Cherbury, born 1581, died 1648. De Veritate, Paris 1624, Lond. 1633. De Religione Gentilium, Amst. 1663, in English, Lond. 1704. Life, written by himself, 1764. He reduced the truths of natural religion to five points:—1. Being of God; 2. Duty of Worship; 3. Virtue and piety; 4. Repentance; 5. Retribution in this world and the next. He was answered by *Locke*, *Baxter*, *Gassendi*, *Halyburton*, *Leland*; and by *Kortholt*, De tribus impostoribus (Herbert, Hobbes, and Spinoza), Hamb. 1701.]

(5) [*Charles Blount*, born 1654, committed suicide 1693. Anima Mundi, 1679; Religio Laici; Oracles of Reason, 1695. Life of Apollonius of Tyana, fol., Lond. 1680.]

(6) [*John Toland*, born in county Derry, Ireland, 1670, died 1722. Christ. not Mysterious, Lond. 1696; an Apology for Mr. T. by himself, written the day before his book was resolved to be burnt by the Committee of Religion, 1697; Nazarenus, or Jewish, Gentile, and Mohamed. Christianity, 2d ed. 1718; Collection of Pieces, 2 vols., Lond. 1726. His Christ. not Mysterious was answered by *John Norris*, Abp. *Synge* of Tuam, and Bp. *Browne* of Cork.]

(7) [*Anthony Collins*, born 1676, died 1729. Essay on the Use of Reason, 1707; on Immortality, in the Dodwell Controversy, 1707, 1708; Priestcraft in Perfection, 1710; History of XXXIX. Articles, 1724 (*Bennett's* Essay in reply to the former book, 1815); Vindication of the Divine Attributes, 1710; Discourse on Freethinking, 1713. His work was answered by Bentley, in his Remarks upon a late Dis-

course on Freethinking, by Philaleutherus Lipsiensis, 1713, 1719, 1743, transl. into several languages.]

(8) [*Thomas Woolston*, born 1669, died 1733, next attacked the miracles, in his Discourses on the Miracles, 1727, for which he was sentenced to a year's imprisonment and a fine of one hundred pounds; the work reached a 6th ed., 1729. He zealously advocated the allegorical interpretation, in opposition "to the ministry of the letter." Some twenty replies were published.]

(9) [*Matthew Tindal*, born 1657, died 1733; Rights of Christ. Church, and Defence, 1706–1709; his Christianity as Old as the Creation, was published when he was 73 years old, in 1730, the ablest work in vindication of the perfection of natural religion. In reply, *Waterland*, Script. Vindicated; *Law's* Case of Natural Religion. *John Leland*, Dublin 1733, Lond. 1740, 2 vols.]

(10) [*Thos. Morgan*, died 1743; his chief work was, The Moral Philosopher, Lond. 1737, 2d ed. 1738, 3 vols.]

(11) [The Earl of *Shaftesbury*, born 1671, died 1713. The Moralist, 1709; Sensus Communis, 1710. His Characteristics, 1711–1723, 3 vols., are intended to exalt virtue at the expense of revealed religion, making virtue its own reward, needing no religious sanctions.]

(12) [*Bernard Mandeville*, born in Holland 1670, removed to England about 1700, died 1733. The Fable of the Bees; or, Private Vices Public Benefits, 2 vols., Lond. 1714. *William Law's* Remarks on the Fable of the Bees, with an Introd. by *F. D. Maurice*, Cambr. 1844.]

(13) [Hon. *Robert Boyle*, son of Earl of Cork, born 1626, died 1691. Works, 6 vols. 4to, Lond. 1772, with Life by *T. Bird*. The Boyle Lecture Sermons were founded "to prove the truth of the Christian Religion against infidels, without descending to any controversies among Christians." A collection, from 1691 to 1732, was published in 1739, in 3 vols. fol. *Richard Bentley* gave the first course. *Samuel Clarke's* Demonstration of Being and Attributes of God, and his Sermons on Natural Religion, were the Boyle Lectures for 1704, 1705.]

(14) [*Joseph Butler*, Bp. of Durham, born at Wantage, Berkshire, 1692, Preacher at the Rolls 1718, Bp. of Bristol

1738, and of Durham 1750, died 1752. Works, new ed., Oxford, 2 vols. 1837, 1849, with Life by *Samuel Halifax*, Bp. of Gloucester. His Analogy of Religion, Natural and Revealed, to the Constitution and Course of Nature, was published in 1733. His Sermons on Human Nature were said by Dr. Chalmers to be "the most precious repository of sound ethical principles extant in any language." The Analogy has been frequently edited; by *Wilkinson*, 1847; *Angus*, 1855; *Steere*, 1857. Among other writers in this controversy were *Thos. Halyburton* (born 1674, Prof. Div. St. Andrews 1710, died 1712), Natural Religion Insufficient, 1714, against Herbert and Blount; *William Law* (born 1686, a Nonjuror, died 1761), The Case of Reason, or Natural Religion fairly and fully stated, in reply to Tindal; *John Norris*, Reason and Faith in Relation to the Mysteries, Lond. 1697; *Ch. Leslie*, Short and Easy Method with Deists (works, 7 vols., Oxf. 1832); *Peter Browne* (Bp. of Cork and Rosse, died 1735), Answer to Toland's Christ. not Mysterious, 1697; *John Leland* (born 1691, died 1766), Remarks on *H. Dodwell's* Christianity not founded on Argument, 1744; Divine Authority of the Old and New Testament; Defence of Christianity, in Answer to Tindal; Advantage and Necessity of Christian Religion; View of the Principal Deistical Writers.]

§ 239.

Division of the Material.

To facilitate the survey of the history of doctrines during the present period, it will be necessary to begin, in the special part of it, with those doctrines which most distinctly represent the doctrinal differences between the two greater ecclesiastical bodies, *i.e. the opposition between Roman Catholics and Protestants* (1), and then pass over to those in which the greater sections of the Church were more or less agreed (in opposition to the minor sects), and where the antithesis between *Romanism and Protestantism* either becomes of minor importance or entirely disappears. To the first class belong the doctrine

respecting the sources of religious knowledge, which may be said to constitute the *formal* principle of Romanism and Protestantism; the doctrine respecting man, sin, justification, and the plan of salvation, in which the so-called *material* principle of Protestantism and Romanism respectively is brought; and, lastly, those doctrines which most clearly display the logical consequences of both these principles, viz. the doctrines of the Church (2), of the sacraments (with the exception of baptism), and of purgatory (which forms a part of eschatology) (3). To the second class belong theology proper and Christology, the doctrine of holy baptism and of the last things (eschatology) (with the exception of purgatory).

(1) The principal point of opposition we may, with *Neander* (Kath. u. Prot. s. 30), state in this manner, that we have in Protestantism "*the immediate relation of the religious consciousness to Christ*," whilst in Catholicism we have "this relation resting upon the mediation of an external or visible Church." Along with this leading principle, we must also have constant regard to the subordinate antagonism between the Lutherans and the Reformed (Calvinists), which first came out in the doctrine respecting the Lord's Supper, afterwards in the doctrine of predestination, and was also exhibited on other points, without, however, involving on either side an abandonment of the common ground of Evangelical Protestantism in its fundamental principles. Here, too, may be considered the deviating views of the lesser religious parties, somewhat receding from the general Protestant principles, so far as they bear upon those doctrinal points.

(2) The doctrine concerning the Church also belongs, in a certain aspect, to the fundamental controverted points, especially from the Roman Catholic point of view; see the treatise of *Baur* in answer to *Möhler's* Symbolik, s. 60 ff. But the views of Protestants concerning the Church resulted rather from their principles on other points.

(3) It has, indeed, its inconveniences, thus to separate the different points embraced in the *locus* respecting the sacraments, and in eschatology; but the advantage is found in presenting *Symbolism* in its true and natural relation to the

whole *History of Doctrine,* thus facilitating a general view of the antagonistic positions.—In the doctrines that have respect to Theology and Christology, and in the doctrine respecting Baptism, come up the chief points of opposition between the larger churches and the sects (Unitarians, Anabaptists).

B. SPECIAL HISTORY OF DOCTRINES DURING THE FOURTH PERIOD.

FIRST CLASS.

THE CHARACTERISTIC DOCTRINES OF ROMANISM AND PROTESTANTISM.

(INCLUDING THE OPPOSITION BETWEEN LUTHERANS AND REFORMED AND THE OPINIONS OF THE MINOR RELIGIOUS PARTIES AND SECTS.)

FIRST DIVISION.

THE DOCTRINE CONCERNING THE SOURCES OF KNOWLEDGE.

(THE FORMAL PRINCIPLE.)

FORMAL PRINCIPLE.

§ 240.

Roman Catholicism and Protestantism.

Heppe, Die Dogmatik des deutschen Protestantismus, s. 211 ff. *Hase*, Polemik (2 Ausg.), 68 ff. *Neander*, Katholicismus und Protestantismus, s. 69-99. *Möhler*, Symbolik (6th ed.), s. 455-505.

FROM the commencement of the Reformation it became evident, in the course of the struggle, that its adherents proceeded upon a different *formal* principle (as to the source of knowledge and rule of faith) from that held by the Roman

Church of that period. For while the advocates of the Roman Church continually appealed to the authority of tradition, the Protestants refused to yield to any arguments, but those clearly drawn from Scripture (1). This primitive difference was prominently brought forward in the symbolical books in general, and in those of the Reformed Church in particular (2). It may be specified in the four following particulars:—1. While the Protestant Church asserts that the sacred writings of the Old and New Testaments are the only sure source of religious knowledge, and constitute the sole rule of faith (3), the Roman Catholic Church assumes the existence of another source, together with the Bible, viz. tradition (4). 2. According to Protestants, the Holy Bible is composed only of the *canonical* scriptures of the Old and New Testaments (5), while the Roman Catholics also ascribe canonical authority to the so-called *Apocrypha* of the Old Testament (6). 3. The Roman Catholic Church claims the sole right of interpreting the Scripture (7), while the Protestant Church concedes this right, in a stricter sense, to every one who possesses the requisite gifts and attainments, but in a more comprehensive sense to every Christian who seeks after salvation; it proceeds upon the principle that Scripture is its own interpreter, according to the *analogia fidei* (8). With this is connected, in the *fourth* place, the assumption of the Roman Catholic Church, that the Vulgate version, which it sanctions, is to be preferred to all other versions as the authentic one, and is thus to a certain extent of equal importance with the original (9), while Protestants regard the original only as authentic (10).

(1) *Luther* was led to his view respecting the Scriptures as the only rule of faith from his views of justification; he came to the *formal* by means of the *material* principle. Contending against the false doctrine of justification, first, in connection with the sale of indulgences, he first of all appealed to the Pope; then from the Pope ill instructed, to the Pope to be better instructed; then to a council; until at last he recognized

the authority of Scripture as alone decisive, and elevated this to the rank of a formal principle. Even in his Protestation at the end of his Theses, he says that he is not so presumptuous as to prefer his opinion to the opinion of all; but also, that he is not so wanting in understanding as to put the *divine word* below *fables of human invention* (Werke, *Walch's* edition, xviii. s. 254 ff.). He is more definite at the Leipzig Disputation (ibid. s. 1160), saying that no Christian can be forced to bind himself to *aught but the Holy Scriptures, which alone have divine right.* In his *Resolutions,* he rises distinctly above the authority of councils. Compare his other controversial works,[1] and his position at the Diet of Worms; see, further, *Schenkel,* Das Wesen des Protest. i. s. 20 ff. What Luther thus attained to was further developed by *Melanchthon,*[2] Loci Theol., ed. *Augusti,* p. 4 ss.: Imo nihil perinde optarim, atque si fieri possit, Christianos omnes in solis divinis litteris liberrime versari et in illarum indolem plane transformari. Nam cum in illis absolutissimam sui imaginem expresserit divinitas, non poterit aliunde neque certius neque purius cognosci. Fallitur quisquis aliunde Christianismi formam petit, quam e Scriptura canonica. Comp. also the passage in the later editions, in *Bretschneider,* Corpus Reform. xxi. p. 453, 685 ss., 732. On the distinction which he makes between Scripture and the Word of God, see *Heppe,* l.c. s. 216.— *Zwingli* came more speedily than Luther to a clear view of the Scriptures as a rule of faith, although he did not at first emphasize Scripture *as such,* but the *Word of God* in contrast with the *doctrines of man.* Thus, in his treatise, "Von der Klarheit und Gwüsse des göttlichen Wortes" (Werke, i. s. 81), he says: "In fine, that we may stop having to give an answer

[1] Thus, against Henry VIII. (Werke, xix. s. 336): "I set the Scripture against all the *sayings* of the Fathers, against the act and word of all angels, men, devils. Here I stand, here I bid defiance, here I show myself proud, and say: God's word is to me above everything, divine majesty is on my side."

[2] According to *Neander* (Kath. und Prot. s. 87), Melanchthon had distinctly asserted, even *before* Luther, that Holy Scripture is independent of all other authority, and explains itself by itself alone, the all-sufficient rule and source of knowledge for Christian faith. Comp. the passages adduced by Neander: Contra Eckium defensio (Corp. Ref., ed. Bretschneider, i. 113), and Epistola ad Hessium v. Febr. 1520 (ib. 138); and, in fact, the expressions of Luther quoted above refer more to the authority of the divine word in general, than to that of Scripture in particular.

to everybody about all sorts of objections, this is our view, that the word of God must be held by us in the highest honour (by word of God meaning only what comes from the Spirit of God), and that to no word should be given such faith as to that. For this word is certain, cannot fail; it is clear, and will not let us wander in darkness; it teaches itself, expounds itself, and makes the human soul to shine with all salvation and grace," etc. Compare his declarations at both of the Zürich Disputations. He speaks of the *Scripture* itself first in his Archeteles (Opera, iii.; see *Ebrard*, Abendmahlslehre, ii. 46 ff.). Thus on p. 32: Scripturam sacram ducem ac magistram esse oportet, qua si quis recte usus sit, impunem esse oportet, etiamsi doctorculis maxime displiceat. And here the highest rule is what *Christ* teaches, *ibid.* p. 30: Cunctis posthabitis huc tandem veni, ut nulla re, nullo sermone tam fiderem, atque eo, qui ex ore Domini prodiit. P. 31: Dum lapidem inquiro, non invenio alium, quam lapidem offensionis et petram scandali, ad quam offendunt, quotquot Pharisæorum more irritum faciunt præceptum Dei propter traditionem suam. His itaque in hunc modum comparatis, cœpi omnem doctrinam ad hunc lapidem explorare, et si vidissem lapidem eundem reddere colorem vel potius doctrinam ferre posse lapidis claritatem, recepi eam; sin minus, rejeci. . . . Ad hunc thesaurum, puta ad certitudinem verbi Dei, dirigendum est cor nostrum.—And in his Expositio Simplex (Opera, iv. p. 67): Non vel jota unum docemus, quod non ex divinis oraculis didicerimus, neque sententiam ullam, cujus non primarios ecclesiæ doctores, prophetas, apostolos, evangelistas, episcopos, interpretes, sed priscos illos, qui purius ex fonte hauserunt, auctores habeamus. (That is, he urges, in respect to Scripture, the idea of its original and primitive authority.) Moreover, according to Zwingli, "Scripture can be understood only through and by faith, and faith be confirmed, as to its being right, only by the Scripture, which is rightly understood by faith." (The Analogia fidei. He gives as an example, the case of one who should try to put a horse to a cart without harness or lines, or to draw the cart with ropes without the horse; both belong together; German Works, ii. 2, s. 3.) The principle about Scripture is more abstractly presented by *Calvin*, Instit. i. c. 6, § 2: Sic autem habendum est, ut

nobis affulgeat vera religio, exordium a cœlesti doctrina fieri debere, nec quemquam posse vel minimum gustum rectæ sanæque doctrinæ percipere, nisi quis *Scripturæ* fuerit discipulus. Unde etiam emergit veræ intelligentiæ principium, ubi reverenter amplectimur, quod de se illic testari Deus voluit. (Compare what he says in the context of this chapter, and in the subsequent chapters.) At the same time, even with Calvin, the Scripture *as* Scripture is not the primary, but the secondary principle. Comp. vi. 2: Indubium tamen est, insculptam fuisse eorum (hominum) cordibus firmam doctrinæ certitudinem, ut persuasi essent atque intelligerent a Deo profectum esse quod didicerant. Semper enim Deus indubiam fecit verbo suo fidem, quæ omni opinione superior esset. *Tandem* ut continuo processu doctrinæ veritas sæculis omnibus superstes maneret in mundo, eadem oracula quæ deposuerat apud patres, quasi publicis tabulis consignata esse voluit.

(2) The Lutheran symbols do not contain any separate article, De Sacra Scriptura, but occasionally oppose tradition. Comp. Confess. August. p. 13, 28 ss. Apolog. p. 205 ss. Art. Smal. p. 337. The Form. Concord. is more definite, p. 570. On the other hand, the symbols of the Reformed Church, for the most part, commence with the article, De Sacra Scriptura, or have a special article elsewhere (see the next note). The only exception is the first Confession of Basel, which nevertheless concludes with a submission of all its articles to the authority of Scripture. Compare note 3.

(3) Art. Smal. l.c.: Regulam autem aliam habemus, ut videlicet *verbum Dei* condat articulos fidei, et præterea nemo, ne angelus quidem. Form. Conc. l.c.: Credimus . . . unicam regulam et normam, secundum quam omnia dogmata omnesque doctores æstimari et judicari oporteat, nullam omnino aliam esse, quam prophetica et apostolica scripta cum V. tum N. T. Reliqua vero sive patrum sive neotericorum scripta, quocunque veniant nomine, sacris litteris nequaquam sunt æquiparanda. Comp. Sol. Decl. p. 632.—Conf. Helv. I. (Bas. II.): Scriptura canonica, verbum Dei, Spiritu S. tradita, *omnium perfectissima et antiquissima philosophia,* pietatem omnem, omnem vitæ rationem, sola perfecte continet.—Conf. Helv. II. 1: Credimus et confitemur, scripturas canonicas sanctorum prophetarum et apostolorum utriusque Testamenti ipsum verum esse Verbum

Dei, et auctoritatem sufficientem ex semetipsis, non ex hominibus habere. Nam Deus ipse loquutus est patribus, prophetis, et apostolis, et loquitur adhuc nobis per Scripturas sanctas. Et in hac Scriptura sancta habet. . . . In hac Scriptura sancta habet universalis Christiana ecclesia plenissime exposita, quæcunque pertinent cum ad salvificam fidem tum ad vitam Deo placentem recte informandam. . . . Sentimus ergo ex hisce scripturis petendam esse veram sapientiam et pietatem, ecclesiarum quoque reformationem et gubernationem omniumque officiorum pietatis institutionem, probationem denique dogmatum reprobationemque aut errorum confutationem omnium, sed admonitiones omnes.[1] Cap. 2: Non alium sustinemus in causa fidei judicem, quam ipsum Deum per Script. S. pronunciantem, quid verum sit, quid falsum, quid sequendum sit, quidve fugiendum.—Repudiamus traditiones humanas, quæ tametsi insigniantur speciosis titulis, quasi divinæ apostolicæque sint, viva voce apostolorum et ceu per manus virorum apostolicorum succedentibus episcopis ecclesiæ traditæ, compositæ tamen cum scripturis ab his discrepant, discrepantiaque illa sua ostendunt, se minime esse apostolicas. Sicut enim Apostoli inter se diversa non docuerunt, ita et apostolici non contraria apostolis ediderunt. Quinimo impium esset asseverare, apostolos viva voce contraria scriptis suis tradidisse.—Comp. Conf. Gall., Art. 5; Belg. 7; Angl. 6; Scot. 18, etc., quoted by *Winer*, s. 30 f. The Remonstrants and Socinians agreed with the Protestants in this general formal principle. See Conf. Remonstr. i. 10 ss., i. 13; Cat. Racov., Qu. 31 and 33, quoted by *Winer*, s. 31 f. Concerning the sense in which Protestants take *tradition*, see below (§ 244).[2] That the same importance should afterwards be assigned to the symbolical writings of the Protestant Churches, which was formerly ascribed to tradition (Form. Conc. Helv. 26), was not the

[1] The Confession, however, grants that God *can* enlighten man in an extraordinary manner, even without the preaching of the word: *Agnoscimus interim*, Deum illuminare posse homines, etiam sine externo ministerio, quos et quando velit; id quod ejus potentiæ est. Nos autem loquimur de usitata ratione instituendi homines, et præcepto et exemplo tradita nobis a Deo.

[2] In reference to *external rites* (which are transmitted to us by tradition), the Conf. Angl. says, Art. 34: Traditiones atque ceremonias easdem, non omnino necessarium est esse ubique, aut prorsus consimiles. Nam ut variæ semper fuerunt, et mutari possunt, pro regionum, temporum, et morum diversitate,

intention of their original authors; see the conclusion of the first Confession of Basel: "And lastly, we submit this our confession to the authority of Holy Writ, and are willing to render grateful obedience to God and His Holy Word, whenever we shall be better instructed therefrom." Comp. Confess. Helv. II., and Confess. Scot. at the close of the preface.

(4) Conc. Trid., Sess. IV. (De Canon. Scripturis): Synodus . . . hoc sibi perpetuo ante oculos proponens, ut sublatis erroribus puritas ipsa evangelii in ecclesia conservetur . . . perspiciensque veritatem et disciplinam contineri in libris scriptis *et sine scripto traditionibus*, quæ ex ipsius Christi ore ab apostolis acceptæ, aut ab ipsis apostolis *Spiritu Sancto dictante, quasi per manus traditæ*, ad nos usque pervenerunt: orthodoxorum patrum exempla secuta, omnes libros tam V. quam N. T. cum utriusque unus Deus sit auctor, *nec non traditiones ipsas*, tum ad fidem, tum ad mores pertinentes, tanquam vel oretenus a Christo, vel a Spiritu Sancto dictatas et continua successione in ecclesia catholica conservatas, pari pietatis affectu ac reverentia suscipit et veneratur. . . . Si quis autem . . . traditiones prædictas sciens et prudens contemserit, anathema sit. Comp. Cat. Rom. præf. 12; and on the nature of tradition, see the passages from *Bellarmine*, De Verbo Dei, iv. 3 (quoted by *Winer*, s. 30). *Cani*, Loci Theolog. 3. The doctrine of the Greek Church is similar, Confess. orthodox. p. 18: *Φανερὸν πῶς τὰ ἄρθρα τῆς πίστεως ἔχουσι τὸ κῦρος καὶ τὴν δοκιμασίαν, μέρος ἀπὸ τὴν ἁγίαν γραφὴν, μέρος ἀπὸ τὴν ἐκκλησιαστικὴν παράδοσιν.*

(5) Compare the passage in note 3, and what is said of the *prophetica* et *apostolica* scripta V. et N. T.—The Apocrypha was more distinctly rejected in the symbols of the Reformed Churches, as well as in those of the Arminians, Mennonites, and Socinians. Confess. Helv. II. 1. Gall. 3, 4. Confess. Belg. 6. Confess. Remonstr. i. 6. (*Winer*, s. 41.) Some

modo nihil contra verbum Dei instituatur. Traditiones et ceremonias ecclesiasticas, *quæ cum verbo Dei non pugnant*, et sunt auctoritate publica institutæ atque probatæ, quisquis privato consilio volens, et data opera, publice violaverit, is, ut qui peccat in publicum ordinem ecclesiæ, quique lædit auctoritatem magistratus, et qui infirmorum fratrum conscientias vulnerat, publice, ut cæteri timeant, arguendus est. Quælibet ecclesia particularis, sive nationalis, auctoritatem habet instituendi, mutandi, aut abrogandi ceremonias, aut ritus ecclesiasticos, *humana tantum auctoritate institutos*, modo omnia ad ædificationem fiant.

confessions of faith even contain lists of the canonical writings, *e.g.* Conf. Angl. 6 ; Belg. Art. 4. (But the free examination of the canon was thus prevented or limited.)

(6) Conc. Trid., Sess. IV. Decret. 1.—Respecting the reasons by which the Roman Catholic Church may have been induced to ascribe so much importance to the Apocrypha (which, indeed, contained proofs of some of its doctrines, but with which it could dispense in consequence of the authority ascribed to tradition), see *Marheinecke*, Symb., Bd. ii. s. 234 ff. *Winer*, s. 41.

(7) Conc. Trid., Sess. IV. Decret. de Edit. et Usu S. S.: Ad coërcenda petulantia ingenia decernit (Synodus), ut nemo suæ prudentiæ innixus, in rebus fidei et morum ad ædificationem doctrinæ christianæ pertinentium, sacram scripturam ad suos sensus contorquens contra eum sensum, quem tenuit et tenet sancta mater ecclesia, *cujus est judicare de vero sensu et interpretatione Scripturarum Sanctarum*, aut etiam contra unanimem consensum patrum ipsam scripturam sacram interpretari audeat, etiamsi hujusmodi interpretationes nullo unquam tempore in lucem edendæ forent. Qui contravenerint, per ordinarios declarentur et pœnis a jure statutis puniantur. The particular comment is given by *Bellarmine*, De Verbo Dei, iii. 3. The principal question is, where the Spirit is to be found ; to which he of course replies, in the Church. When controversies arise (which were foreseen by God), there must be some authority to decide. But this can be neither the Sacred Scriptures, nor a revelation made to an individual, nor the secular power. Accordingly, no other authority remains than the princeps ecclesiasticus, *i.e.* the pope, either alone or in connection with the bishops. Scripture, like a law, admits of several interpretations. In every well-ordered state the power of legislation and the power of jurisdiction are two different things. The law commands, the judge interprets the law, therefore Scripture cannot be its own interpreter. Yet neither pope nor council can interpret arbitrarily, but according to divine guidance. Comp. *J. Gretsari*, Tractat.: Unde scis, hunc vel illum esse sincerum et legitimum Scripturæ sensum.—*Cani*, Loci Theolog. lib. iv. *Becani*, Manuale, i. 5.—The Greeks agree with the Roman Catholics as regards the general principle of the authority of the Church, but limit it

to the Œcumenical Councils. See the passages in *Winer*, s. 35 f. *Klausen*, Hermeneutik, s. 286 ff.

(8) As early as the time in which the various disputations with the Roman Catholics took place, the Reformers claimed the right of free interpretation of Scripture, *i.e.* an interpretation independent of the councils. Comp. *Zwingli*, Von der Klarheit des Wortes Gottes (Deutsche Schriften, i. s. 76 ff.); also his Antwort an Val. Compar (ibid. i. 2, s. 9 ff.). *Calvin*, Instit. i. 7, 8. Here again the symbols of the Reformed Churches express themselves in more definite language than those of the Lutheran Church (*Winer*, l.c.). Confess. Helv. I. (II. Confess. of Bas.) Art. 2: Scripturæ Sacræ interpretatio ex ipsa sola petenda est, ut ipsa interpres sit sui, caritatis fideique regula moderante.—Conf. Helv. II. c. 2: Scripturas sanctus dixit Ap. Petrus (2 Pet. i. 20), non esse interpretationis privatæ. Proinde non probamus interpretationes quaslibet: unde nec pro vera aut genuina scripturarum interpretatione agnoscimus eum, quem vocant sensum Romanæ ecclesiæ, quem scilicet simpliciter Romanæ ecclesiæ defensores omnibus obtrudere contendunt recipiendum. Sed illam duntaxat scripturarum interpretationem pro orthodoxa et genuina agnoscimus, quæ ex ipsis est petita scripturis (ex ingenio utique *ejus linguæ, in qua sunt scriptæ*, secundum circumstantias item expensæ et pro ratione locorum vel similium vel dissimilium plurium quoque et clariorum expositæ) cum regula fidei et caritatis congruit et ad gloriam Dei hominumque salutem eximie facit. Comp. Conf. Scot. 18. Conf. Remonstr. i. 14.—The *Socinians* distinctly avowed the same principle in agreement with the orthodox Protestants. Cat. Racov., Qu. 36: Etsi difficultates quædem in S. S. occurrunt, tamen multa alia, tum ea, quæ sunt ad salutem necessaria, ita perspicue aliis in locis S. S. sunt tradita, ut ab unoquoque, *maxime vero pietatis ac veritatis studioso et divinam opem implorante*, possint intelligi.—It is also to be observed, that the Protestants fully recognized the distinction, on the one hand, between the learned interpretation and the general common-sense understanding of the Scripture, and on the other, between such a general understanding and the *more profound insight* into the meaning of Scripture, which is granted to none but the regenerate. Comp. the passages in Luther's works (*Walch*, ix. s. 857). "*Analogia*

fidei and the aid of the Holy Spirit were acknowledged as the guiding stars in the interpretation of Scripture." *Winer*, s. 37. On the principles of interpretation adopted by the Reformers, see *Schenkel*, l.c. i. s. 67 ff.[1]

(9) Conc. Trid., Sess. 4: Synodus, considerans non parum utilitatis accedere posse ecclesiæ Dei, si ex omnibus latinis editionibus quæ circumferunter, sacrorum librorum, quænam pro authentica habenda sit, innotescat, statuit et declarat, ut hæc ipsa vetus et vulgata editio, quæ longo tot sæculorum usu in ipsa ecclesia probata est, in publicis lectionibus, disputationibus, prædicationibus, et expositionibus pro *authentica* habeatur et ut nemo eam rejicere quovis prætextu audeat vel præsumat. Respecting the meaning of the passage, see *Winer*, s. 39, and the passages quoted by him from *Bellarmine* and the doctrinal writers of the Roman Catholic Church; *Schröckh*, Kg. seit der Ref. iv. s. 132 ff.; *Marheinecke*, Symb. ii. s. 241 ff. —This canon shows that its authors not only ascribed minor importance to the original, but were also virtually opposed to translations into modern languages (inasmuch as even the texts of sermons are to be selected from the Vulgate), and also to their circulation among the laity. Comp. *Winer*, s. 40.

(10) The Confess. Helv. II. 2 has a reference to the original (comp. note 8). In accordance with their principles of interpretation, the Protestants asserted that a more precise scientific study of the Sacred Scriptures is impossible, without the knowledge of the original languages; accordingly, *exegesis*, founded upon solid philological studies, forms among Protestants the basis of the study of theology. On the other hand, they determined as definitely, that a version as faithful as possible to the original was sufficient for practical purposes. But it never would have occurred to them to select among these translations one (*e.g.* that of Luther), and designate it as the only authentic one; though many have, to the present day, hesitated to enlighten the people on the differences sometimes existing between the translation and the original. But is this Protestant?

[1] In respect to the obscure passages of Scripture, Luther says (*Walch*, xviii.): "Let it go where it is dark; hold to it where it is clear."—"To interpret and illustrate Scripture by Scripture," was his hermeneutical canon, and that of the Reformers, which they carried out in a practical way. Comp. *Zwingli* in note 1, above.

§ 241.

Divergent Views of some Sects.

(*a*) *The Mystical Principle.*

The Protestants maintained the authority of Scripture, not only in opposition to the Catholic principle of tradition, but also against the mystical principle which insists upon the *internal* word, at the expense of the external. Among the advocates of the latter were included not only the Anabaptists, who, besides holding stiffly to the letter of Scripture (1), also appealed, like the Montanists, to new revelations (2); but also others, who insisted upon the insufficiency of the external word, agreeing more or less with the Anabaptists. Among them were *Sebastian Franck* (3), *Caspar Schwenkfeld* (4), *Theobald Thamer* (5), and *Michael Servetus* (6). In essential agreement with them were the *Quakers* (7), as well as the followers of *Labadie* (8), who attached great importance to internal revelation, as that by which the external revelation is rendered intelligible, and from which it receives its authority. From the negative point of view, these sects supposed, like the Roman Catholics, the existence of another authority *in addition* to that of Scripture, or rather *above* it; positively, they differed more widely from Catholicism than did the Protestants, by rejecting every objective authority, and appealing to nothing but subjective experience, mere internal feeling (9). Thus the Protestant doctrine of the authority of Scripture occupies an intermediate position between the ecclesiastical objectivity of Roman Catholicism, and the mystical subjectivity of Separatism.

(1) Even *Carlstadt* was stiff upon the letter of Scripture; see *Schenkel*, i. s. 40 ff. On his earlier and more moderate view, see the work, De Canonicis Scripturis Libellus D. Andreæ Bodenstein Carolstadii, etc., Wittemb. 1520; and

Erbkam, Prot. Secten, s. 189. The opposition of the Zwickau people to infant baptism is also to be explained in part as an exaggeration of the formal principle of Protestantism. On the literalness of the Swiss Anabaptists, particularly *Hubmeier*, and the polemics of Zwingli against them, see *Bullinger* in *Schenkel*, i. s. 47 ff. Zwingli wrote his Elenchus against them (Opera, iii. p. 367).

(2) *Planck*, i. s. 44. They were, on the one hand, extremely literal, and yet they insisted strongly, on the other hand, upon the difference of the letter and the spirit (according to 2 Cor. iii. 6). Comp. *Calvin* in his Institutes, i. 9. How Luther and the Reformers regarded their visions and new revelations is well known; see, *e.g.*, Luther's letter to Melanchthon in *De Wette's* Briefe Luthers, ii. Nr. 358; compare the opinions of *John Denck* and *Hetzer*, cited in *Schenkel*, i. s. 143. *Hagen*, Geist der Reform. ii. s. 282. The later and more moderate Mennonites returned to Scripture.

(3) *Sebastian Franck*, in his work, Das verbütschirte, mit sieben Siegeln verschlossene Buch, tries to show that the literal interpretation of Scripture involves us in inextricable contradictions: "God means to use the Scripture to drive us to the Scripture, and make us anxious and fearful thereby, so that we may be forced out of the Scripture back again to and into *Him*, and hasten to ask counsel of *His* mouth and Spirit," etc. "The Scripture," he says, "is both good and evil, clear and obscure, according to the mode in which we take it in hand; to the perverse, it is evil and dark. Therefore the Holy Spirit will not permit us to be satisfied with the Scripture, or to make an idol of it, as if we always stood in need of it; but sends us to inquire of Him for the right understanding and interpretation of it." See his treatise, Wie alle Ding vor in der Natur sind (in *Schenkel*, i. s. 140).—"Even the devil can be very scriptural, yea, even put himself into the midst of the letters of Scripture, as he has already done by so many sects, who have nothing but vain Scripture on their side." (Preface to his Zeitbuch.) "The Scripture-learned devil makes anything and everything out of Scripture." See Paradoxa, s. 134 (in *Schenkel*, l.c. *Hagen*, s. 336 ff. *Erbkam*, s. 295 ff.).

(4) *He wrote:* De Cursu Verbi Dei, edit. *J. Œcolampadius*, Bas. 1527. *Schwenkfeld* maintained in this work that faith

does not proceed from external things, such as the external word or from hearing, but from the internal word, which must be antecedent to the ministration of the external. Abraham believed without sermon and without hearing. The letter is only the channel of the Spirit; they should not be confounded with each other. Schwenkfeld also made a parallel between the Bible and nature (comp. Raimund of Sabunde). The whole world is to him "a great book, all glorious with paintings and descriptions, in many sorts of letters, of the works of God." These works are "living letters," which men ever have before their eyes; they are the genuine "peasants' calendar," the real "lay Bible," in which those can read who do not understand any other kinds of writings. Hence Christ points to the birds of heaven and the lilies of the valley. See *Schenkel*, ubi supra, s. 150. Yet Schwenkfeld did not take a position of hostility to the Bible; it was to him the test by which to try all divine revelation. Comp. *Erbkam*, s. 425 ff.

(5) On him see *Neander*, Theobald Thamer, the Representative and Forerunner of Modern Spiritualistic Tendencies in the Times of the Reformation, Berlin 1842. *Hochhuth*, De Theobaldi Thameri vita et Scriptis, Marb. 1858. Comp. *Niedners* Zeitsch. 1861, and *Herzog*, Realencykl. xv. s. 667.— *Thamer* was accustomed not to read the gospel text in the pulpit, but to recite it without book, "because a real evangelical preacher ought not only to learn the dead letter, but *to be a Bible* in his works, prayers, and life." *Neander*, s. 21. He accused Luther and his disciples of deifying the letter of the Bible: "When any one asks thee, how thou knowest that these texts are the gospel? thou repliest by bringing forward a perverted witness, the Scripture and the letter, written on paper with ink, which in itself is as good as dumb, and answers thee in a dead language, which thou dost not understand. This human, yea, Jewish and perverted sense, thou not only holdest to be higher than *conscience, which is the revealed Deity itself*,[1] and than all God's creatures and works,

[1] In another place, Thamer calls conscience the true living throne of grace, "where we ask God how and what we ought to do or leave undone. One may hear the external Scripture for a thousand years, and if he has not within him the living word, the Godhead of Christ, or the conscience, it is to him no word

but thou also makest it to be the queen of all saints and angels in heaven." Anything, according to him, is not true because it stands in the Bible, but it is in the Bible because it is true of itself; see *Neander*, s. 24 f. *Schenkel*, i. s. 144 f. Like Schwenkfeld, he also appeals to the revelation in nature, and accuses his opponents of Manichæism; comp. *Neander*, s. 31.—[*Thamer* studied in Wittenberg 1535, was prof. in Marburg, 1543, died 1569.]

(6) *Servetus*, too, divides Scripture into an internal and an external word; and in this sense it is to him a two-edged sword. He also shows how Christianity is older than the Scripture (the New Test.). See his Christianismi Restitutio, p. 627: Illud verum est, quod sine Scripturis stare potest ecclesia Christi vera; et erat ecclesia Christi, antequam apostoli scriberent. Ecclesiæ prophetia, interpretatio et vox viva præfertur Scripturæ mortuæ. *Schenkel*, l.c.

(7) *Barclaii* Apol., Thes. 2: . . . Divinæ revelationes internæ, quas ad fundandam veram fidem absolute necessarias esse adstruimus, externo scripturarum testimonio aut sanæ ratione ut nec contradicunt, ita nec unquam contradicere possunt. Non tamen inde sequitur, quod hæ revelationes divinæ ad externum scripturarum testimonium aut etiam ad rationem naturalem seu humanam,[1] tamquam ad nobiliorem aut certiorem normam et amussim, examinari debeant. Nam divina revelatio et illuminatio interna est quiddam per se evidens et clarum, intellectum bene dispositum propria evidentia et claritate cogens ad assentiendum, atque insuperabiliter movens et flectens non minus, quam principia communia veritatum naturalium (cujusmodi sunt: totum est majus sua parte; duo contradictoria non possunt esse simul vera aut falsa) movent flectuntque animum ad assensum naturalem. Comp. the commentary to this thesis in *Winer*, s. 53. On the principle of interpretation, see Apol. x. 19, p. 198: Quidquid homo sua industria

at all." *Neander*, s. 28. Thamer tried to ridicule the orthodox idea of inspiration: "They imagine it to have been like this, that God sat there with a grey beard, as the painters represent Him on the wall, and took up a word with His hand, *i.e.* a sound, and put it on the tongue of Jeremiah," etc. *Neander*, s. 26.

[1] His principle is therefore not to be confounded with that of the Rationalists. Barclay places the internal revelation alike *above* reason and Scripture (mystical supranaturalism).

in linguis et eruditione in scripturis invenire potest, totum nihil est sine spiritu, absque quo nihil certum, semper fallibile judicatum est. Sed vir rusticus, hujusque eruditionis ignarus, qui ne vel elementum norit, quando scripturam lectam audit, eodem spiritu hoc esse verum dicere potest, et eodem spiritu intelligere, et si necesse sit, interpretari potest.—iii. 4, p. 44: . . . Nullus adeo illitteratus, surdus, aut tam remoto loco positus est, quem non attingat et recte instruat; cujus etiam spiritus evidentia et revelatio ea sola est, qua difficultatibus illis, quæ de scripturis occurrunt, liberamur.

(8) Though the Sacred Scriptures *contain* truth, they *are not* themselves the *truth*, but God and Jesus Christ are that truth. Properly speaking, the Bible itself does not give eternal life, but God, who is life, works it in us. . . . We are to believe the mouth of God, the Holy Spirit, who still speaks to us, rather than the pen of the writers whom He employed. Divine truth is infinite, nor can it be restricted to any letter; therefore there may be many truths which are divine truths, without being verbally contained in Scripture, and which to reject merely because they are not found in Scripture, would be sinful. We are not to believe a doctrine because it is *written*, but because it comes *from God*. (In contrast with a degenerate adherence to the letter in later times, such views are worthy of notice.) See *Arnold*, Kirchen- und Ketzerhistorie, Thl. ii. Buch 17, s. 687 (Frankf. edit. 700).

(9) In common with the Catholic Church, and in opposition to the principle adopted by the Quakers, Protestantism asserts the necessity of having something *positive*, which is objectively *given*, but finds it in Scripture alone and not in the authority of the Church. In common with the Quakers, and in opposition to Catholicism, it rejects the authority of the Church. Thus the Quakers will regard the historico-positive tendency of Protestantism as a catholic element, while Roman Catholics will regard that principle as separatist because of its internal and subjective character.

§ 242.

(*b*) *The Rationalistic Principle.* (*Socinians.*)

Protestants not only rejected these mystical notions, but to the same extent the rationalistic principle, according to which the authority of Scripture is subordinate to that of reason, and its interpretation made to depend on the so-called truths of reason (1). Such a doctrine was approached by Socinianism, which acknowledged the necessity of an external revelation (2) and the authority of the Bible, though in the first instance only of the New Testament (3); but, proceeding upon the fundamental principle, that Scripture cannot contain anything that is either incomprehensible or contrary to reason (*i.e.* to the reason of Socinians) (4), naturally led, in many cases, to the most arbitrary interpretations (5).

(1) Luther in several passages expressed himself against reason, considering it to be blind in spiritual things.

(2) *Faustus Socinus* went so far as to assert the impossibility of a mere religion of reason without a higher revelation. Opp. ii. p. 454*a*: Homo ipse per se nec se ipsum nec Deum ejusque voluntatem cognoscere potest, sed necesse est, ut hæc illi Deus aliqua ratione patefaciat. Comp. Prælectt. Theol. c. 2, and *Fock*, l.c. s. 291 ff. *Ostorodt*, Unterr. s. 10: "Men, however, do not derive their knowledge of God, or of the Godhead, either from nature or from the contemplation of creation, but from tradition, since God has from the beginning revealed Himself to them. Those who have not at all heard of Him are not likely to have any opinion about any one Deity." The later Socinians departed more or less from these strict supranaturalistic views.[1]

(3) On the views of Socinus and his followers respecting the Sacred Scriptures, see the subsequent sections, and *Fock's*

[1] "*The idea of revelation is not at all defined in the symbolical books, and the earlier theologians were either wholly silent on the subject, or gave very indistinct definitions.*" *De Wette*, Dogmatik, s. 32. It was discussed anew in the controversy with the Deists.

Socinianismus. The Socinians, however, received only the New Test. as canonical; see Catech. Racov. p. 1, and *Socinus*, De Auctor. S. S. c. 1, p. 271*b* (in *Winer*, s. 32 f.). In his opinion the Old Test. has only a historical value, but its dogmatic and religious importance is not greater than that which other Protestants ascribe to the Apocrypha. It is *useful*, but not *necessary* to be read. Comp. *Diestel*, Die Socinianische Anschauung vom A. T. in the Jahrb. f. d. Theol. vii. 4 (1862).

(4) *Schlichting*, Diss. de Trin. p. 70: Mysteria divina non idcirco mysteria dicuntur, quod etiam revelata omnem nostrum intellectum captumve transcendunt, sed quod nonnisi ex revelatione div. cognosci possunt. *C. Zerrenner*, Neuer Versuch zur Bestimmung der dogmatischen Grundlehren von Offenbarung und heil. Schrift nach den socin. Unitariern, Jena 1820. (*Winer*, s. 39.)

(5) Compare below the sections on Christology. As the Protestant doctrine of the Scriptures occupies an intermediate position between the Roman Catholic principle and that of the Quakers (§ 241, note 9), so it holds the medium between Quakerism and Socinianism, *i.e.* between a purely *internal* supernaturalism of feeling and a purely *external* supernaturalism of the understanding, which tends to rationalism. The principle of the Protestants is such as to induce them to combine depth with clearness, fervour with sobriety. It must, however, be admitted that this principle has not been always carried out in its purity.

§ 243.

Further Development of the Doctrine concerning the Holy Scriptures.

Inspiration and Interpretation.

Though the Reformers submitted in reverence and faith to the authority of Scripture as a divine revelation, they also had an unprejudiced regard to its *human* side, taking a comprehensive view of inspiration, especially in its practical bearing (1). But the Protestant theologians of later times frequently manifested such a narrow adherence to the letter of

Scripture, that, in opposition to the less rigid views of Arminians (2) and Socinians (3), they were induced to hazard the boldest assertions (4). The orthodox divines also developed the formal aspect of the *locus de Scriptura* (5), while the mystics reminded men that "the letter killeth, but the Spirit giveth life" (6). *Spener*, in particular, endeavoured to revive the Protestant principle of Scripture in its practical bearings, and thus to reconcile the spirit with the letter, in the sense of true Protestantism (7). The Catholic Church in general held firmly to the idea of inspiration, though the views of the Jansenists on this point were stricter than those of the Jesuits (8). —As regards the interpretation of Scripture, theologians of all denominations employed (consciously or unconsciously) the allegorical system, along with the grammatico-historical; but the latter was frequently dominated by the dogmatism of the Church doctrines (9).—While *Coccejus* taught that every passage of Scripture was pregnant with sense, the example of the Arminians and Socinians, who were most earnest for a moderate interpretation (10), was followed by others (11). Even the Socinian principle, that Scripture revelation cannot contradict reason, was approved of by some, especially towards the close of the present period (12).

(1) *Luther* had experienced in his own case the practical blessings of the Scripture, and everywhere shows the profoundest reverence for the Bible and the most lively sense of its divine blessedness, and of its peculiar worth as distinguished from all human writings. So that he does not scruple to say that we must look upon the Scripture "as if God Himself had spoken therein" (against Latomus in *Walch*, xviii. s. 1456); and he calls the Holy Spirit "the most clear and simple writer that there is in heaven and on earth" (*Walch*, xviii. s. 1602). Once he terms the holy word of Scripture "God Himself" (*Walch*, ix. s. 688). . . . "To sum up all, the Holy Bible is the highest and best book of God, full of comfort in every temptation; for it teaches on faith, hope, and love very different things from those which reason can see and feel, comprehend and experience; and in adver-

sity it teaches how these virtues are to shine forth, and that there is another and eternal life *above* this poor and miserable one." Tischreden (Frankf. 1576), fol. 1. Along with this profound reverence for Scripture, he also expressed himself very freely about individual writers. Thus (in the Preface to the New Test. of 1522) on the relation of the Gospels to each other, on the Epistles of James (epistola straminea) and Jude, on the Apocalypse, etc.[1] Comp. the Preface to *W. Linkens*, Annotatt. über die fünf Bücher Moses: "And without doubt the prophets studied Moses, and the later prophets studied the earlier ones, and wrote down in a book their *good thoughts, inspired by the Holy Ghost.* And though these good and true teachers and searchers sometimes fell upon hay, straw, and wood, and did not build of pure silver, gold, and precious stones alone, yet the foundation remains; the rest will be burnt up by the fire of the great day, as St. Paul says (1 Cor. iii. 13)." In another place he says (*Walch*, vii. s. 2044): "Moses and the prophets preached, *but in them we do not hear God Himself;* for Moses received the law from the angels, and so had a less high order. When now I hear Moses enjoining good works, I hear him as I do one who executes the orders of an emperor or prince. *But this is not to hear God Himself.* For when God Himself talks with men, they cannot hear anything but pure grace, pity, and all that is good."—That Luther concedes the existence of historical contradictions (*e.g.* between the Pentateuch and Stephen's address), is shown by *Schenkel*, i. 56 f.[2] Compare the passages in which he distinctly declares that *Christ* is above the Scripture; and that when the opponents insist upon Scripture against Christ,

[1] Of special importance for the history of criticism at that time is the work of *Carlstadt*, De Canonicis Scripturis, written in 1520, edited by *Credner* in his Zur Geschichte des Kanons, Halle 1847. *Carlstadt* blamed Luther's judgment on James. On the other hand, he earnestly defended the exclusion of the Old Testament Apocrypha from the canon; see *Jägers* Carlstadt, s. 92 ff. *Brenz* agreed with Luther about the Catholic Epistles and the Apocalypse, but, like Carlstadt, decidedly rejected the Apocrypha of the Old Testament; see *Heppe*, s. 224. Among the Lutheran theologians, *Haffenreffer* is the last who walks in this track; he calls the ἀντιλεγόμενα of the New Testament, outright, the Libri Nov. Test. Apocryphi; see *Heppe*, s. 248. On the views of the Reformed divines, see *Heppe*, s. 254.

[2] *Bretschneider* collected the freer statements of Luther on inspiration in his work, Luther an unsere Zeit, 1817, s. 97–99.

he "insists upon Christ against the Scripture" (*Walch*, viii. s. 2140, and xix. s. 1749, in *Schenkel*, s. 226 f.).—*Melanchthon*, too, claims only freedom from error for the apostles as to *doctrine*, but not in the application of doctrine (with reference to the difference between Paul and Barnabas, and the attitude of Paul to Peter at Antioch); see his Postil., Part II. p. 985. *Heppe* (s. 222) says: "*There is no trace in Melanchthon of a proper theory of inspiration!*"—*Zwingli* also regarded Scripture with sober, unprejudiced eyes, and considered the principal proof of its divinity to consist in the practical effects which it produces. . . . "Take some good strong wine; he who is in good health enjoys it, for it makes him cheerful, strengthens him, and warms his blood; but he who is suffering from pestilence or from fever may not even taste it, and still less drink it; and he wonders how people in health can drink it. But that is not on account of the wine, but on account of his disease. In the same manner the word of God is perfect in itself, and revealed for the welfare of man; but he who neither loves it nor understands it, nor will receive it, is sick. Thus much in reply to those who daringly assert that God does not mean His word to be understood as if He desired to exclude us from its light" (Deutsche Schriften, i. s. 68; comp. s. 81). Thus also, in Epistolam Jacobi (Opp. vi. 2, p. 256), he beautifully remarks: Scriptura sacra pelagus est immensum et impermeabile, a nullo adhuc pro dignitate emensum, campus in quo omnia omnium sæculorum ingenia exercentur. At the same time, Zwingli regards the inward sense of truth as the criterion of the outward words of Scripture. Antwort an Valentin Compar (Deutsche Schriften, ii. 1, s. 16): "He who is in covenant with God understands all things, whether they are a part of the divine testimony or not. Here must the inner man take cognizance of and judge the outer word, whether it is consistent with divine truth or not. And the outer word, although preserved by many thousands, must not compel the believer to receive it." S. 17: "In short, the outer word must be judged by the inner, which God has written on the heart." Zwingli admits freely the possibility of relative error in the sacred writers in external things, but without injury to the higher truth which they reveal: Tametsi enim in persona et tempore nonnunquam, in re tamen nun-

quam errarunt Sanctissimi viri (Annotatt. in Genesin, Opp. v. p. 27). These slight contradictions of the sacred writers, far from injuring the authority of the Bible, seem rather to render it more credible. "Its meaning is clear, it matters little if the place and time are somewhat differently given." Comp. Uslegung und Grund des Schlussreden (Deutsche Schriften, i. s. 388).—In *Calvin*, on the other hand, we find very strict ideas of inspiration; Instit. i. c. 7, 4: Tenendum, non ante stabiliri doctrinæ fidem, quam nobis indubie persuasum sit, *auctorem ejus esse Deum.* He appeals to the testimonium Spiritus Sancti. Idem ergo Spiritus, qui per os prophetarum loquutus est, in corda nostra penetret necesse est, ut persuadeat fideliter protulisse, quod divinitus erat mandatum . . . Illius (Spiritus Sancti) virtute illuminati, jam non aut nostro aut aliorum judicio credimus, a Deo esse Scripturam; sed supra humanum judicium, certo certius constituimus (non secus ac si ipsius Dei numen illic intueremur), hominum ministerio *ab ipsissimo Dei ore ad nos fluxisse.* Other passages in *Schenkel*, i. s. 62 f. But with all this, Calvin grants a difference in Scripture in respect to form. Instit. i. 8, 1: Lege Demosthenem aut Ciceronem, lege Platonem, Aristotelem, aut alios quosvis ex illa cohorte; mirum in modum, fateor, te allicient, oblectabunt, movebunt, rapient; verum inde si ad sacram istam lectionem te conferas, velis nolis ita vivide te afficiet, ita cor tuum penetrabit, ita medullis insidebit, ut præ istius sensus efficacia vis illa rhetorum ac philosophorum prope evanescat, *ut promtum sit perspicere, divinum quiddam spirare sacras scripturas,* quæ omnes humanæ industriæ dotes ac gratias tanto intervallo superent. 2: Fateor quidem Prophetis nonnullis elegans et nitidum, imo etiam splendidum esse dicendi genus, ut profanis scriptoribus non cedat facundia, ac talibus exemplis voluit ostendere Spir. S. non sibi defuisse eloquentiam, *dum rudi et crasso stilo alibi usus est.* As instances, he adduces David and Isaiah on the one hand; Amos, Jeremiah, and Zechariah (quorum asperior sermo rusticitatem sapit) on the other.

(2) *Limborch*, Theol. Christ. i. 4, 10: De inspiratione Script. S. concludimus hinc, libros hosce a viris divinis scriptos, qui non tantum non errarunt, sed et, quia spiritu Dei regebantur, in tradenda voluntate divina errare non potuerunt; qui, sicut

non propria voluntate, sed instinctu Spiritus S. ad scribendum se accinxerunt (2 Pet. i. 22), ita etiam in scribendo a Spir. S. directi fuerunt (2 Tim. iii. 6), adeo ut errorem nullum committere potuerint, nec in sensu ipso exprimendo, nec in verbis sensum continentibus divinum conscribendis aut dictandis. *Si quædam non exacte definiverint, fuere ea non res fidei* aut præcepta morum, sed rerum majorum parvæ circumstantiæ, ad fidem fulciendam nullum habentes momentum, circa quas tamen non errarunt aut memoria lapsi sunt, *solummodo eas, quia necesse non erat, accurate et præcise non determinarunt.*—*Grotius*, indeed, made much bolder assertions in his Votum pro Pace ecclesiastica (De canonicis scripturis.—Opp. Theol., Amst. 1679, t. iii. p. 672):—Non omnes libros, qui sunt in hebræo Canone, dictatos a Spir. S. . . . scriptos esse cum pio animi motu non nego . . . sed a Spiritu Sancto *dictari* historias nihil fuit opus. . . . Vox quoque Spiritus Sancti ambigua est; nam aut significat . . . afflatum divinum, qualem habuere tum Prophetæ ordinarii, tum interdum David et Daniel, aut significat *pium motum*, sive facultatem impellentem ad loquendum salutaria vivendi præcepta, vel res politicas et civiles, etc. (compare the subsequent sections on different readings, etc.). —*Episcopius* also passed judgment with much freedom on the canon (Institutt. iv. 1, 4): In hoc volumine continentur varii libelli, non qui singuli singulas religionis christianæ particulas in se habent, et conjuncti totam religionem christianam complectuntur ac constituunt; seu veluti partes essentiales totum, adeo ut si unus tantum deficeret aut deesset, religio Christi tota destruenda et plane desitura aut defutura esset; seu veluti partes integrales, ita ut librorum istorum uno aut pluribus deficientibus religio Christi mutila et trunca esset futura. Nihil minus: plures enim sunt libelli, qui nihil continent, quod non in aliis et sæpius et luculentius reperitur; et sunt, qui nihil ad religionem christianam magnopere faciens continent. Denique certum est, libellos hos in codicem seu volumen unum digestos fuisse non divino jussu aut impulsu, sed consilio studioque humano, licet sancto pioque, etc.—He laid great stress upon the fides humana, viz. that the sacred penmen both would and could speak truth, etc. Comp. c. 2.

(3) " *Socinianism, in accordance with its dualistic and mechanical standpoint, could not regard the special mode of the*

influence of the Holy Spirit in any other aspect than that of an unmediated interposition of the divine causality in the very midst of human individuality; in this respect Socinianism occupies the same point of view with the older Protestantism and Catholicism;" Fock, Socinianismus, s. 329. Thus *Socinus* says, in a way quite orthodox, that the sacred writers wrote, ab ipso divino Spiritu impulsi, *eoque dictante* (Lectiones Sacræ, p. 287, in *Fock,* l.c.). Yet he restricts inspiration to what is essential, and concedes slight errors in what is unessential (leviter errare); see the passages in *Fock,* s. 332; and *Socinus,* De Auctoritate Scripturæ, Racov. 1611 (Opera, i. s. 265 ff.).

(4) The Consensus Repetitus Fidei veræ Lutheranæ (ed. *Henke,* s. 5) asserts, against Calixt, Punct. 6: Profitemur et docemus, omnia scripta prophetica et apostolica dici divina, quia a Deo ceu fonte sunt et divinitus tradita veritas, nihilque in illis inveniri, quod Deum non habeat auctorem, vel Deo inspirante, suggerente, et *dictante* non sit scriptum, testibus Paulo, 1 Cor. iii. 13; 2 Tim. iii. 16; et Petro, 2 Pet. i. 20 s. Rejicimus eos, qui docent, scripturam dici divinam, non quod singula, quæ in ea continentur, divinæ peculiari revelationi imputari oporteat, sed quod præcipua, sive quæ primario et per se respicit ac intendit scriptura, nempe quæ redemptionem et salutem generis humani concernunt, nonnisi divinæ illi peculiari revelationi debeantur. (Even passages like 2 Tim. iv. 13 form no exception.) This rigid adherence to the very letter of Scripture (grammatolatry) manifested itself especially in the Formula Consensus, 1: Deus O. M. verbum suum, quod est potentia ad salutem omni credenti (Rom. i. 16), non tantum per Mosen, Prophetas, et Apostolos scripto mandari curavit, sed etiam pro eo scripto paterne vigilavit hactenus et excubavit,[1] ne Satanæ astu vel fraude ulla humana vitiari posset. Proinde merito singulari ejus gratiæ et bonitati Ecclesia acceptum refert, quod habet habebitque ad finem mundi sermonem propheticum firmissimum; nec non *ἱερὰ γράμματα,* sacras litteras, ex quibus, pereunte cœlo et terra, ne apex quidem vel iota unicum peribit (2 Pet. v. 19; 2 Tim. iii. 15; Matt. v. 18). 2: In specie autem hebraïcus V. T. codex,

[1] How much this mere *watching* and *guarding* of a dead treasure is in accordance with their lifeless notions of God, and the relation in which He stands to the world, is evident. Nothing creative, either in the one case or the other!

quem traditione Ecclesiæ judaïcæ, cui olim oracula Dei commissa sunt (Rom. iii. 2), accepimus hodieque retinemus, *tum quoad consonas, tum quoad vocalia sive puncta ipsa* sive punctorum saltem potestatem, et *tum quoad res, tum quoad verba θεόπνευστος*, ut fidei et vitæ nostræ, una cum Codice N. T. sit Canon unicus et illibatus, ad cujus normam ceu Lydium lapidem universæ quæ extant versiones, sive orientales sive occidentales, exigendæ, et sicubi deflectunt, revocandæ sunt. (But compare *Schweizer*, Die theol. ethischen Zustände, s. 37.) —The Lutheran theologians also maintained that the Hebrew vowel points were original; *Joh. Gerh.* Loci Theol. i. c. 14 s. *Quenst.* i. 272 ss. *Hollaz*, Prol. iii. Quæst. xliii. and others.—The controversies respecting the purity of the Greek of the New Test. belong to the same class (Purists and Hebraists); see *Winer*, Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Sprachidioms, Einleitung [Eng. ed. with valuable additions by *Moulton*, Edin. var. edd.], and *Gass*, s. 159. In the year 1714, *G. Nitsch* (who died 1729, superintendent in Gotha) even raised the question whether the Holy Scripture was God Himself or a creature? Comp. *Walch*, Relig.-Streitigkeiten der evang. Kirche, iii. s. 145, and i. s. 966. *Tholuck*, l.c. s. 253 ff.

(5) Thus the idea of *inspiration* was more precisely defined; it was at first identified with revelation, but afterwards treated of by itself (see *Heppe*, s. 250). Comp. *Gerhard*, Loci, i. c. 12, § 12: *Causa efficiens* Scripturæ Sacræ principalis est Deus. § 18: Causæ instrumentales fuerunt sancti homines. Scripserunt non ut homines, sed ut Dei homines h. e. ut Dei servi et peculiaria Dei organa. *Hollaz*, Prol. iii. Qu. vi. p. 75: . . . Sicut *scriptura, quam homo alteri in calamum dictat*, recte dicitur verbum humanum in litteras relatum, ita Scriptura a Deo inspirata verissime dicitur verbum Dei litteris consignatum. Quæst. xvi.: Conceptus omnium rerum, quæ in sacris litteris habentur, prophetis et apostolis a Spir. S. immediate inspirati sunt. Qu. xviii.: Omnia et singula verba, quæ in sacro codice leguntur, a Spir. S. prophetis et apostolis inspirata et in calamum dictata sunt. Compare other passages quoted by *De Wette*, Dogmatik, and *Hase*, Hutterus Redivivus.—The divinity of Scripture was founded partly upon the fides divina (the testimony of the Holy Spirit), and partly upon the fides humana (*αὐθεντία* and *ἀξιοπιστία*); it then served in its turn

as the source from which the so-called *affectiones Sacræ Scripturæ* were derived. These were: I. Affect. primariæ: 1. divina auctoritas, 2. veritas, 3. perfectio, 4. perspicuitas (semetipsam interpretandi facultas), 5. efficacia divina; II. Secundariæ: 1. necessitas, 2. integritas et perennitas, 3. puritas et sinceritas fontium, 4. authentica dignitas. Attention was also directed to the simplicitas et majestas stili, etc. Comp. *Gerhard*, Loci, l.c.; *Calov.*, Systema, t. i. p. 528 ss., and the other compendiums of systematic theology. (See *Hase*, Hutterus Redivivus, p. 99 ss.; *De Wette*, p. 39.) Comp. *Gass*, Geschichte d. Theologie, s. 235 ff.; *Heppe*, Dogmatik des deutschen Protest. s. 240 ff.

(6) *Luther* was no stranger to the thought, that the external word alone is not sufficient, but that the Holy Spirit, working internally in the hearts of the readers (hearers), is needed to produce a right understanding of the Scriptures; see his Letters in *De Wette's* edition, v. s. 85, Nr. 1784; and the passages cited by *Heppe*, s. 235. The later orthodox theology, too, was familiar with the idea of the testimony of the Holy Spirit; see *Klaiber*, Die Lehre der altprotestant. Dogmatiker von dem Testimonium Spiritus Sancti, und ihre dogmatische Bedeutung, in the Jahrbücher für deutsche Theologie, 1857, 2. Also Zwingli in note 1 above.—But the mystics of the Protestant Church were the chief opponents of the literal orthodoxy. Thus *Jakob Böhm* said: "Though reason may cry: Give me only the letter of Scripture, yet the external letter does not impart sufficient knowledge, although it may guide us in our researches; the living letter also, which is the independent and revealed word and nature of God, must, through the medium of the revealed word, be laid open and read in the man, who is taught and instructed by the Holy Ghost Himself;" in the preface to his work, Von der Geburt und Bezeichnung aller Wesen, quoted by *Umbreit* in his Jakob Böhm, s. 66.—Previous to the time of Böhm, *Sebastian Frank* of Wörd (who lived in the sixteenth century) had maintained that "the devil himself may be well versed in Scripture, and even adhere to its very letter, as he is now doing in the case of so many sects which have nothing in their favour but mere Scripture," etc., quoted by *Umbreit*, l.c. s. 60; see § 241. *Weigel*, Postille, Thl. ii. s. 61 f., iii. s. 84, says: "Scripture,

as such, is a dead letter, and an empty word, which only sounds through the air;" and in another work, entitled Gülden Griff, c. 19: "It is not enough to say here is such a writer, and he has the Holy Spirit, he cannot make a mistake. My dear friend, first of all prove the truth of thy statement; thou wilt find it a difficult work to prove and demonstrate it. What is Cephas? who is Paul? says the apostle; who is this man or that? They are men. It is *God, God, God* alone, who works faith, and imparts judgment to try all spirits and writings." Comp. *Walch*, Einleitung in die Religionsstreitigkeiten, Bd. iv. s. 1044 f. In the same manner *Christian Hoburg* (quoted by *Hollaz*, ed. *Teller*, p. 75) expressed himself as follows: "Scripture is an old, cold, and dead thing, which makes men mere Pharisees."—*Arnd*, Wahres Christenthum, s. 28, used more moderate language, but more to the point: "God did not reveal Holy Scripture that it might remain a dead letter, but that it might become a living power within us, and create in us an entirely new and spiritual nature, otherwise it is of no use. All that Scripture teaches externally must be worked into man through Christ, in the spirit and in faith." Ibid. s. 89: "*The living Christ is the book which we must read, and from which we must learn.*" On the *Rothmann* controversy as to the efficacy of the word of the Bible, see *Cotta*, Præf. in *Gerhard*, p. 24; *Walch*, Einleitung in die Religionsstreitigkeiten der Luth. Kirche, i. s. 524 ff.; *Gass*, s. 265.

(7) *Spener* agreed with the mystics in this, that the dead letter avails nothing. But he opposed quite as decidedly the pre-eminence assigned to the Spirit without Scripture. Thus he said, in opposition to the notions of the Quakers: "Our feelings are not the rule of truth, but divine truth is the rule of our feelings. This rule of truth exists in the Divine Word *apart from ourselves;*" see the passages quoted by *Hennicke*, s. 6 and 7.—On the right of the laity to read and search the Sacred Scriptures, he expressed himself as follows in his Geistliches Priesterthum (Frankfurt 1677), s. 29: "Since the epistle of our heavenly Father is addressed to all His children, no child of God is to be excluded from its perusal; all have not only the right, but are also commanded, to read it." "They must also search the Scriptures that they may be

enabled to verify the teaching of their minister, in order that their faith may not be founded upon the authority and testimony of a man, but upon divine truth." But Spener made special efforts to render the *Bible* practical,[1] both among the people (by a more popular interpretation of Scripture), and among theologians by his Collegia Biblica. See his Pia Desideria (Francf. 1712), p. 94 ss..

(8) The Universities of Louvain and Douay condemned (A.D. 1588) the position of the Jesuits, that it was not necessary to suppose that all the words of Scripture are inspired by the Holy Ghost. A controversy respecting inspiration was carried on (A.D. 1622) between the Jansenists and the Jesuit *Jean Adam.* In his opinion the sacred penmen have sometimes made exaggerated statements; on the whole, it is by no means necessary to take everything in Scripture in its most literal sense. The Jansenists showed the dangerous tendency of such assertions. *Reuchlin,* Gesch. von Port-Royal, i. s. 613 ff. —In opposition to the Protestant doctrine concerning Scripture, *Bellarmine* maintained (De Verbo Dei, iv. 4): . . . Apostolos non de *scribendo,* sed de *prædicando* Evangelio primaria intentione cogitasse. Præterea, si doctrinam suam litteris consignare *ex professo* voluissent, certe catechismum aut similem librum confecissent. At ipsi vel historiam scripserunt, ut Evangelistæ, vel epistolas ex occasione aliqua, ut Petrus, Paulus, Jacobus, etc., et in iis *nonnisi obiter* [?] disputationes de dogmatibus tractaverunt. *Bellarmine* rejects the testimony of Scripture in favour of inspiration, as a testimony in its own cause; not only the Bible, but also the Koran, claims inspiration! He further maintains that there is no sure criterion for the canonicity of the separate books in Scripture itself,[2] etc.—Nor were the critical investigations of *Richard Simon* reconcilable with the idea of verbal inspiration.

[1] *Spener* thought it even desirable (s. 38) that the laity should study Greek and Hebrew, "to be enabled to understand the revelations of the Holy Spirit in His own language;" nevertheless, "the want of acquaintance with foreign languages does not exclude pious Christians from a true knowledge of that which God has deemed useful for the edification of their souls."

[2] To refute *Calvin* (Instit. vii. 12), in whose view the Sacred Scriptures are distinguished from profane writings, as light from darkness, and sweet from sour, he adduced the opinion of Luther, who called the Epistle of James an epistle of straw.

Comp. his Traité de l'Inspiration des Livres Sacrés, Rotterd. 1687, etc.

(9) On the difference between the hermeneutical principles of the Protestants and those of the Roman Catholics, see above, § 240, notes 7 and 8. For further particulars, compare *Clausen*, Hermeneutik, s. 227 ff.

(10) Liber de potentia S. S.—Comp. Aphorismi contra Pontificios.—Animadversiones in Bellarmini controversias. His main principle was, "*that the words of Scripture must everywhere be supposed to signify just as much as they may mean and signify.*" In essential opposition to the principle of Arminians and Socinians, according to which every passage is to be considered separately and in its historical limits (so that passages are not to be adduced in parallelism, by the analogy of faith), Coccejus endeavours to treat the various books of the Bible as parts of a greater whole, so that the one is reflected in the other. Comp. *Clausen*, Hermeneutik, s. 282 ff. It is a well-known saying: Grotium nusquam in sacris litteris (V. T.) invenire Christum, Coccejum ubique.—Some orthodox divines, like *Calov*, inveighed with all earnestness against the emancipation of exegesis from dogmatics; see *Gass*, s. 164 ff. *Hyperius*, among the Reformed divines, made some concessions to the allegorical mode of interpretation; see *Heppe*, s. 253.

(11) Thus *Turretine*, *Werenfels*, and others. The sceptical sentence of Werenfels is well known:

> Hic liber est, in quo sua quærit dogmata quisque,
> Invenit, et iterum dogmata quisque sua.

(12) Thus *Bekker* (Die bezauberte Welt, Vorr. s. 11 ff.) represented reason as preceding Scripture, but maintained that they did not contradict each other. "To say the truth, reason must precede Scripture, because Scripture presupposes reason: I mean sound reason, to which Scripture must prove its divine origin. Reason exists along with Scripture, speaking of things concerning which the latter is silent. Scripture exists along with reason, because it teaches us something very different, which does not belong to the province of reason. And lastly, Scripture is nevertheless above reason, not as lord and master (for each has its respective office), but because it possesses greater dignity and larger means. . . . But at times it

happens that they meet by the way, or have a meeting in some house, and thus assist each other; both remain, however, free, with this difference only, that reason, acknowledging its inferiority, always pays deference to Scripture."

Though Protestants were accustomed to consider both the Old and the New Testament as constituting the one rule of faith, it was natural that the material principle of faith, as seen in the evangelical doctrine of justification by faith, should exert a reaction upon the formal, and render necessary some kind of subordination of the Old Testament to the New (of the law to the gospel). The symbolical books make a difference between the ceremonial and the moral law. The former had typical significance, and is already fulfilled; the latter partly shows us the nature of sin (as in a mirror), and partly is still of importance as a rule of life. Comp. Art. Smalcald, Art. 2, p. 319; Apol. p. 83; Confess. Gallic. Art. 23; Belg. 25; Helv. II. c. 12, 13.—In reference to the Antinomian controversy (§ 217, note 7), started by *John Agricola* of Eisleben, see the Formula Concordiæ, Art. 5 and 6 (de tertio usu legis).—But it cannot well be said that the law and the gospel are identical, the one with the Old, the other with the New Testament; for the prophecies in the Old Testament partake of the nature of the gospel, while the New Testament contains moral precepts. See the preface of *Luther* to his translation of the New Testament, 1522. On this whole section, see *Schenkel*, i. s. 165 ff.

§ 244.

Relation of Scripture to Tradition.

Compare the works of *Schmid* and *Gass*, on Calixt, referred to in § 237. [*J. J. Blunt* on The Right Use of the Fathers, London (2d ed.) 1858.]

With all its adherence to the authority of Scripture, Protestantism could not absolutely withdraw itself from the power of tradition (1). For even the authority of Scripture rested upon the belief of the Church. The whole historical development could not be ignored; and the Reformers had no hesitation, in respect to ecclesiastical usages in particular, to concede to tradition a certain regulative, though only human authority (2). But even in relation to the fundamental doctrines of Christianity, Protestantism declared its agreement with the oldest creeds of the Church, because it believed that the pure doctrine of Scripture was contained in them; yet without thinking it to be necessary, or even advisable, to give these

symbols special authority as co-ordinate with the Scriptures (3). Accordingly, when *George Calixt*, in the seventeenth century, advocated the position that the *consensus* of the ancient Church should be taken as an authority alongside of the Scriptures (4), he aroused a lively opposition (5). But with all its theoretical opposition to any other authority than that of Scripture, Protestantism soon came to be dependent upon its own tradition; for the words of Luther, and the declarations of the confessions of faith, became (as it was not intended they should be) in practice a standard and restraint in reference to further exegetical and doctrinal development (6).

(1) Comp. *Winer*, Comparat. Darstellung, s. 33. *Marheinecke*, Symbolik, ii. s. 191 ff. *Schenkel*, Wesen des Protest. i. s. 40 ff. *Neander* (Kath. u. Prot.), s. 88 f. *Hase*, Polemik, s. 75.

(2) As in the case of the baptism of children, and several other observances, like the celebration of Sunday and the Church festivals. Accordingly, the XXXIX. Articles of the Church of England declare (in Art. xxxiv.): "It is not necessary that traditions and ceremonies be in all places one, and utterly like; for at all times they have been diverse, and may be changed according to the diversities of countries, times, and men's manners, *so that nothing be ordained against God's word.* Whosoever, through his private judgment, willingly and purposely, doth openly break the traditions and ceremonies of the Church, *which be not repugnant to the word of God*, and be ordained and approved by common authority, ought to be rebuked openly (that others may fear to do the like), as he that offendeth against the common order of the Church, and hurteth the authority of the Magistrate, and woundeth the consciences of the weak brethren.—Every particular or national Church hath authority to ordain, change, and abolish ceremonies or rites of the Church, *ordained only by man's authority*, so that all things be done to edifying." So the Conf. Aug. i. Art. 5, p. 51: Servantur apud nos pleræque traditiones, quæ conducunt ad hoc, ut res ordine geratur in Ecclesia, ut ordo lectionum in Missa et præcipuæ feriæ. To the same effect, Luther in his Letters (*De Wette's* edition,

iii. 294): Nullas ceremonias damno, nisi quæ pugnent cum evangelio; ceteras omnes in ecclesia nostra servo integras. . . . Nullos magis odi quam eos, qui ceremonias liberas et innoxias exturbant, et necessitatem ex libertate faciunt.

(3) Thus the three œcumenical symbols, the Apostles' Creed, the Nicene, and the Athanasian, were adopted by the Protestant Church, and introduced by the Lutherans into their Book of Concord. *Melanchthon* terms these creeds (in his Enarr. Symb.) breves repetitiones doctrinæ, in scriptis propheticis et apostolicis traditæ. The Second Helvetic Confession appeals to the Confession of Faith of the Roman bishop Damasus (in Jerome), which is printed in the older editions of the Helvetic Confession, and in *Fritzsche*, s. 9 and 10.

(4) *Calixt* defends himself against the accusation, of not regarding the Scripture as sufficient, of holding that it is not unum, primum, et summum principium. He finds in tradition only the *testimony* of the Church to the doctrine of Holy Scripture. Yet still he speaks of two principles; *e.g.* in his De Arte Nova, p. 49: Duo vero sunt principia, quæ tamquam certissima et extra omnem dubitationis aleam posita utrimque admittimus, quæ etiam sufficere credimus—*divinæ legis auctoritas*, tum deinde *ecclesiæ catholicæ traditio*. By tradition he means the consensus primævæ vel priscæ antiquitatis; see his letter to the Landgrave Ernest, p. 22: Nos principium primum ponimus: quidquid Sacra Scriptura docet, est verum; proximum ad hoc: quidquid primorum quinque seculorum ecclesia unanimiter professus est, est verum. P. 23: Quæ autem hisce symbolis, confessionibus, et declarationibus comprehenduntur, e sacra Scriptura hausta sunt. See the other passages in *Schmid*, Dogmatik d. luth. Kirche, s. 121. *Gass*, s. 46 ff.

(5) *Calov* was his chief opponent, in his work, Syncretismus Calixtinus, and other writings; see *Schmid*, s. 240 ff. *Gass*, s. 87 ff. The fifth point in the Consensus Repetitus Fidei Veræ Luth. (in *Henke's* ed. p. 5) was directed against him: Rejicimus eos, qui docent, testimonium ecclesiæ necessarium esse ad cognoscendum Dei verbum, ita ut sine illo per alia κριτήρια cognosci nequeat; auctoritatem sacr. litterarum aliunde non constare, nisi e testificatione ecclesiæ, etc. Comp. Punct. 6–8.

(6) It is well known that *Luther* strongly protested against any prominence being given to his name, and all appeal to his authority. Equally opposed was it to the spirit of the Confessions of Faith, to impose a yoke upon the conscience. The First Confession of Basel solemnly warns against this, at the conclusion: "In fine, we submit this our Confession to the judgment of the divine writings of Scripture, beseeching that if we are better instructed from the Holy Scripture, we may at all times obey God and His word with great thankfulness." Comp. Conf. Helv. II., and Confess. Scotica, at the end of the Preface. The Lutheran Formula Concordiæ also says distinctly, p. 572: Cæterum autem Symbola et alia scripta . . . non obtinent auctoritatem judicis; hæc enim dignitas solis sacris litteris debetur; sed duntaxat pro religione nostra testimonium dicunt eamque explicant, ac ostendunt, quomodo singulis temporibus sacræ litteræ in articulis controversis in ecclesia Dei a doctoribus, qui tum vixerunt, intellectæ et explicatæ fuerint, et quibus rationibus dogmata cum sacra Scriptura pugnantia rejecta et condemnata sint.—On the other hand, the Formula Consensus, Art. 26, brings the Holy Scripture (the word of God) into such connection with the Confessions, that they seem to be put on one and the same line. See also the Conclusiones of the Canons of Dort. [But these Conclusions simply say: "This doctrine the synod judges to be drawn from the word of God, and to be agreeable to the Confessions of the Reformed Churches;" and it warns people to "abstain from all those phrases which exceed the limits necessary to be observed in ascertaining the genuine sense of the Holy Scriptures."] Contest as to the "quia" and "quatenus." On the history, see *J. C. G. Johannsen,* Die Anfänge des Symbolzwanges unter den Protestanten, Lpz. 1847, and the art. "Symbolische Bücher," by *Mallet,* in *Herzog's* Realenc. XV. S. 284 ff.

SECOND DIVISION.

ANTHROPOLOGY, JUSTIFICATION, AND THE ECONOMY OF SALVATION.

(MATERIAL PRINCIPLE.)

A.—ANTHROPOLOGY.

§ 245.

Man before the Fall.

Neander, Katholicismus u. Protestantismus, s. 99 ff. [Bishop *Bull*, Concerning the First Covenant, and the State of Man before the Fall. Works, ii. p. 32-237.]

DURING the present period, the opinion generally prevailed, among Christians of all parties, that the state of the first human beings was more excellent, in respect both to body and to soul, *before* the fall, than *after* it (1). But while theologians of the Roman Catholic Church agreed with the majority of the scholastics in regarding the original righteousness of man as a donum superadditum (2), Protestants (Lutherans as well as Calvinists) maintained that God created man in the possession of perfect righteousness and holiness (3), and that these, as well as immortality, belonged to his original nature. *Arminians* (4) and *Socinians* (5) entertained less exalted opinions concerning the original state of man. The latter asserted that the image of God, after which man was created, has reference only to his dominion over the animal world or the irrational

creation in general, and denied that immortality belonged to the original endowments of human nature (6).

(1) Conc. Trid., Sess. 5: Si quis non confitetur, primum hominem . . . sanctitatem et justitiam, in qua constitutus fuerat, amisisse incurrisseque mortem, quam antea illi comminatus fuerat Deus, anathema sit. (This was in accordance with the definitions of the Protestant Symbols, see note 3.) Comp. the Confess. Orthod. of the Greek Church, p. 50 (in *Winer*, s. 51). The expression "constitutus" (instead of creatus) was chosen at the suggestion of Cardinal Paccheo (see *Neander*, l.c. s. 107).

(2) Cat. Rom. i. 2, 19: . . . Originalis *justitiæ admirabile donum addidit*, ac deinde cæteris animantibus præesse voluit. This is more fully developed by *Bellarmine*, tom. iv., De Gratia primi hom. c. 2, Propos. 4: Integritas illa, cum qua primus homo conditus fuit et sine qua post ejus lapsum homines omnes nascuntur, non fuit naturalis ejus conditio, sed supernaturalis evectio. Comp. c. 5: . . . Quare non magis differt status hominis post lapsum Adæ a statu ejusdem in puris naturalibus, quam differt spoliatus a nudo, neque deterior est humana natura, si culpam originalem detrahas, neque magis ignorantia et infirmitate laborat, quam esset et laboraret in puris naturalibus condita. In the following chapter, the justitia originalis is compared to the hair of Samson, to a festive garment and ornament, etc.[1] C. 6: Virtutes non erant insitæ et impressæ ipsi naturæ, ut sunt dona naturalia, sed extrinsecus assutæ et superadditæ, ut sunt dona supernaturalia. C. 7: The dowry of Paradise was splendid, while that of nature, in its present condition, is like a stepmother's dowry (appealing to Augustine). Comp. *Marheinecke*, Symbolik, Bd. iii., towards the commencement; *Möhler*, Symbolik, § 1; *Baur*, Katholicismus und Protestantismus, s. 60 ff.

(3) *Luther* himself gave it as his opinion, in Gen. c. 3 (Opp. ed. Jen. t. i. p. 83, quoted by *Möhler*, s. 35): Justitiam non fuisse quoddam donum, quod ab extra accederet, separatum a natura hominis, sed fuisse vere naturalem, ut natura Adæ esset diligere Deum, credere Deo, cognoscere Deum, etc.

[1] Other comparisons, *e.g.* that with the wreath of a virgin, a golden bridle, etc., are quoted by *Marheinecke*, Symbolik, iii. s. 12.

On Luther's poetic and fanciful descriptions of the paradisiacal state, see *Schenkel*, ii. s. 4 ff. (Man is made for heaven; that distinguishes him from "cows and swine." The eye of the first man surpassed the lynx and eagle in sharpness; his arm was stronger than the lion and the bear; he went among the strongest animals as if they were whelps.)—*Zwingli* is far more sober, averse from all that is fantastic, perhaps even too spiritualizing, in his views of the primeval state; as in his work, Von der Klarheit des Wortes Gottes (German Works, i. 56): "Were we made in the likeness of God in our bodies, God must also have a body made up of members, after which we were fashioned; whence it would follow that God is a compound, and that the parts might be separated, all of which is opposed to the immutability of the divine nature. . . . Hence it follows that we are fashioned in the image of God in our minds or souls. . . . But what this image is we know not, excepting that the soul is the substance, upon which the image of God is specially impressed. . . . And as we have never seen God in Himself, in His own form, we cannot know how our souls are like Him in substance and nature; for the soul does not even know its own substance and nature. And it comes at last to this, that the workings or powers of the soul, viz. will, understanding, and memory, are nothing but signs of the essential image, which we shall really see, when we see God as He is in Himself, and ourselves in Him (1 Cor. xiii. 12). . . . Now we find in ourselves that the image of God is much more cognate with some things than with the three powers, understanding, will, and memory.[1] . . . I mean, that there are other parts of us in which we may discern the image of God . . . such as the vision of Him and His word; these are things which show that friendship, likeness, and conformity to God may be in us. . . . For the fact that man can look up to God and His Word shows clearly that in his nature he is born somewhat akin to God, that he can follow after Him, that he can be drawn unto Him; from all of which it follows, without any doubt, that he is created in the image of God."—*Calvin* tries to harmonize the bodily and the spiritual, by representing the former as the foil of the latter; Institut. i. 15, § 3: Quamvis imago Dei in homine externo refulgeat,

[1] Referring to Augustine, who finds in these an image of the Trinity.

proprium tamen imaginis semen in anima esse, dubium non est (this is against Osiander, who sought for the image of God in the body). § 4: He speaks of the image of God as integra humanæ naturæ præstantia, quæ refulsit in Adam ante defectionem . . . nunc aliqua ex parte conspicitur in electis, quatenus spiritu regeniti sunt; plenum vero fulgorem obtinebit in cœlo. (He agrees with Zwingli in opposing Augustine's view of the image of the Trinity.) § 8: . . . His præclaris dotibus excelluit prima hominis conditio, ut ratio, intelligentia, prudentia, judicium non modo ad terrenæ vitæ gubernationem suppeterent, sed quibus transcenderent usque ad Deum et æternam felicitatem. . . . In hac integritate libero arbitrio pollebat homo, quo, si vellet, adipisci posset æternam vitam. Comp. *Schenkel*, ii. s. 11 ff.—Among the Lutheran symbols the Augsburg Confession passes by the primitive state of man; but the doctrine is contained in the Apol. Conf. Aug. p. 53 ss.: Justitia originalis habitura erat non solum æquale temperamentum qualitatum corporis, sed etiam hæc dona: notitiam Dei certiorem, timorem Dei, fiduciam Dei aut certe rectitudinem et vim ista efficiendi. Idque testatur Scriptura, cum inquit, hominem ad imaginem et similitudinem Dei conditum esse (Gen. i. 27). Quod quid est aliud, nisi in homine hanc sapientiam et justitiam effigiatam esse, quæ Deum apprehenderet et in qua reluceret Deus, h. e. homini dona esse data notitiam Dei, timorem Dei, fiduciam erga Deum et similia? Comp. p. 52: Propriis viribus posse diligere Deum super omnia, facere præcepta Dei, quid aliud est quam habere justitiam originis? Comp. Form. Concord. p. 640.—Confess. Basil. I. Art. 2: "Concerning man, we confess that he was at first created by God after the image of God's righteousness and holiness" (Gen. i.; Eph. iv.; Gen. iii.). Conf. Helv. II. 8: Fuit homo ab initio a Deo conditus ad imaginem Dei, in justitia et sanctitate veritatis, bonus et rectus. Comp. Conf. Belg., Art. 14; Scotica 2; Gallic. 9; Cat. Heidelb. 6; Canon. Dordrac. 3, 1 (where, perhaps, the strongest statements are made), and Form. Concord. 7.—Compare the definitions of the later Lutheran and Reformed theologians quoted by *De Wette*, Dogmatik, s. 91. *Calov*, iv. 392: . . . Eminebat cognitio primæva præ moderna quorumvis, sive Theologorum sive Philosophorum

aliorumve sapientum peritia et sapientia. *Polan.* p. 2122: Homo integer recte cognoscebat Deum et opera Dei atque se ipsum, et sapienter intelligebat omnia simplicia, singularia, et universalia, eaque recte componebat aut dividebat et ex compositis absque errore ratiocinabatur.—Those theologians who adopted the theory of the covenants supposed the status operum to have had place in this original state of man. Comp. *De Wette*, Dogmatik, s. 91.—*Zwingli* also included the possibility of sinning among the endowments of man's moral nature in his primitive estate. De Provid. Dei (Opera, iv. p. 139): Quanto magis omnium operum rarissimum homo non est miser, quantum ad genus attinet: hic enim quum intellectu præditus sit, supra omnia sensibilia dignitate evehitur. Ea enim, præter hominem, universa intellectu carent, qui ex primis dotibus numinis præcipuus est. Ipsum igitur dum cum numine communem, quantumvis mutuo, habet; jam tanto est nobilior homo reliquis sensibilibus, quanto lux tenebris, volucres reptilibus, et anima corpore. Non est ergo vel imprudentiæ vel indignationis Dei opus homo sic factus, ut labi possit, quemadmodum et de angelo sentiendum est; quum enim soli cum numine intellectum habent, dotem divinissimam, et nihil tam infirmum ac humile est, quod non sit in suo genere et optimum et utilissimum: jam et homo erit in sua classe absolutissime divina providentia factus. Quæ ergo imprudentes miseriæ damus, felicitatis sunt. *Labi potuisse a numine est inditum;* fuit ergo insignis alicujus boni causa. So, too, *Calvin*, l.c. *Bucanus*, iii. (in *Schweizer*, i. s. 888): Adamum flexibilem fecit, non talem, qui non posset nec vellet unquam peccare. Immutabilem esse solius Dei est. *Keckermann*, 141, and others, cited by *Schweizer*, l.c. Comp. *Heppe*, s. 384 ff., 354 ff.

(4) The *Arminian symbols* (Confess. Remonstrant. 5. 5, and Apol. Confess. p. 60*b*, quoted by *Winer*, s. 52) agree with Calvin in insisting on the original freedom of the will, but reject on this very account the notion of a primitive state of perfect holiness, because if there had been such man could not have sinned. Thus *Limborch*, Theolog. Christ. ii. 24, 5, shows that that state of innocence of our first parents, to which so much importance is attached, must have been united with *ignorance* (nesciebant nuditatem esse inde-

coram); otherwise they would have known that serpents cannot speak, and would have been led to suspect something wrong! Limborch admitted that man would not have died if he had not sinned, but he objected to the inference which orthodox theologians drew from it, that immortality originally belonged to the nature of man;[1] he thought that God would have protected him from death.

(5) Cat. Racov. p. 18 (quoted by *Winer*, s. 52). *Socinus*, Præl. c. 3: Si justitiæ originalis nomine eam conditionem intelligunt, ut non posset peccare, eam certe non habuit Adamus, cum eum peccasse constet; neque enim peccasset, nisi prius peccare potuisset.... Concludimus igitur, Adamum etiam antequam mandatum illud Dei transgrederetur, *revera justum non fuisse*, cum nec impeccabilis esset nec ullam peccandi occasionem habuisset, vel certe justum eum fuisse affirmari non posse, cum nullo modo constet, eum ulla ratione a peccatis abstinuisse. Compare also Cat. Racov., Qu. 22 (the last revision as quoted by *Winer*, l.c.). *Fock*, Socinianismus, s. 492 ff.

(6) Cat. Racov., Qu. 40: . . . ut homo nihil habet commune cum immortalitate. Qu. 41: Cur nihil habet commune homo cum immortalitate? Idcirco quod ab initio de humo formatus proptereaque mortalis creatus fuerit. *Socinus*, De Statu primi Hominis ante Lapsum (in opposition to Francis Pucci of Florence), 1578, in the Bibl. Fratr. Polon. ii. p. 253 ss. P. 258: Nego, hominem a Deo immortalem fuisse creatum. But he did not mean to say eum ab ipso creationis initio morti penitus fuisse obnoxium, adeo ut omnino ei moriendum esset, sed tantummodo sua natura morti fuisse subjectum, et nonnisi divina gratia, qua in ipsa creatione donatus non fuerat, a morte immunem perpetuo esse potuisse. In support of his opinion he appeals to 1 Cor. xv. 22 and 2 Tim. i. 10. By thus considering Christ as the true author of life, he advocated the principles of supernaturalism. On similar views entertained by earlier theologians, see § 58, and *Fock*, Socinianismus, s. 483 ff. The latter says (s. 490): "The idea that man became mortal at some definite point of time, being at first immortal, was so

[1] On the question how far other Protestants taught a *posse non mori*, see *Winer*, s. 52.

much opposed to all sound views of nature, that a system which declared that reason was its guide could not be satisfied with it. On the other side, however, we must not overlook the fact that the orthodox doctrine of man's immortality in his primeval estate has an essential speculative kernel, viz. that immortality belongs to the very idea of human nature."

Concerning the opinions of the Mennonites, the Quakers, and the theologians of the Greek Church, which are of less importance, see *Winer*, l.c.

How far *Calixtus* recognized the justitia originalis as a donum supernaturale, and on this account was accused of papistry by his opponents, see in the Consensus Repet., Punct. 17 (*Henke's* edition, p. 14), and *Schmid*, l.c. s. 363.

§ 246.

The Fall and its Consequences. (Original Sin.)

(Definitions of the Symbols.)

In connection with these opinions respecting the original state of man was developed the Protestant doctrine concerning the fall, as propounded in most of the works of the Reformers (1), as well as in the symbolical books of the Churches (2). This doctrine represented the fall of man as a fact by which the nature of man was poisoned in its innermost core, his original holiness and righteousness changed into absolute depravity, and whose consequences have so affected the descendants of Adam as to expose them, in their natural condition, to condemnation, and to make them incapable of anything that is truly good. The views of Roman Catholics were less rigid; in their opinion the fall of man caused only the loss of the gifts of divine grace, the natural consequences of which are his weakness and imperfection (3). The *Arminians* entertained still milder views (4), while the *Socinians* were chiefly Pelagian (5). In accordance with some earlier theologians, they declared physical death to be the chief consequence of the first sin, and derived the

existence of moral infirmity merely from the habit of sinning, but not from the sin of Adam.

(1) The strictly Augustinian view of *Luther* stood in intimate connection with his whole tone of mind, as well as with the experience of his life. It was confirmed by the contests which he maintained against the superficial and legal Pelagianism of his opponents. He developed his principles especially in his controversy with Erasmus, whose views laid down in his treatise, De libero Arbitrio, 1524, he combated in his work, De servo Arbitrio, 1525, in opposition to which Erasmus composed the Hyperaspistes, 1526. In other passages *Luther* also uses very strong language respecting original sin, which he calls, among other things, the leaven of the devil, with which our nature is poisoned (*Walch*, ii. s. 2146 ff., vi. 396, xi. 2605). Comp. *Schenkel*, ii. s. 16 ff. *Heppe*, s. 388 ff. ["Original sin is the real and chief sin; if that were not, there were no actual sins. This sin is not committed like other sins; but it is, it lives, and does all other sins, and is the essential sin; one which does not merely sin an hour or any given time, but wherever and as long as the person lives, there too is sin," Werke, xi. 396.] *Melanchthon*, in the first edition of his Loci, adopted the doctrine of the total corruption of mankind, and the lack of free will; edit. *Augusti*, p. 18 ss., p. 19: Jam posteaquam deliquit Adam, aversatus est Deus hominem, ut non adsit ei gubernator Dei spiritus. Ita fit, ut anima, luce vitaque cœlesti carens, excœcetur et sese ardentissime amet, sua quærat, non cupiat, non velit, nisi carnalia, etc. Ibid.: Sicut in igni est genuina vis, qua sursum fertur, sicut in magnete est genuina vis, qua ad se ferrum trahit, ita est in homine nativa vis ad peccandum.—In his opinion, as in that of Luther,[1] the virtues of the Gentiles are only virtutum umbræ. Thus Socrates, Cato, and others, were only virtuous from ambition. . . . P. 23: Ut rem omnem velut in compendium cogam, omnes homines per vires naturæ vere semperque peccatores sunt et peccant. Comp. *Galle's* Melanchthon, s. 247 ff. Respecting the modifications which occur in later editions of his work, see *Galle*, s. 266 ff., and *Heppe*, s. 386 ff. *Schmid*, s. 569 ff.

[1] In this view Luther goes even beyond Augustine; see *Schenkel*, ii. p. 17.

Zwingli's views on the subject of original sin were more mild than those of any of the other Reformers; he considered it to be *actual* sin only in a certain sense. Thus in his Fidei Ratio, addressed to Charles v. (Opera, iv. p. 6): De originali peccato sic sentio: Peccatum vere dicitur, cum contra legem itum est; ubi enim non lex est, ibi non est prævaricatio, et ubi non est prævaricatio, ibi non est peccatum proprie captum, quatenus scilicet peccatum, scelus, crimen, facinus aut reatus est. Patrem igitur nostrum peccavisse fateor peccatum, quod vere peccatum est, scelus scilicet, crimen ac nefas. At qui ex isto prognati sunt, non hoc modo peccarunt; quis enim nostrum in paradiso pomum vetitum depopulatus est dentibus? Velimus igitur nolimus, admittere cogimur, peccatum originale, ut est in filiis Adæ, non proprie peccatum esse, quomodo jam expositum est; non enim est facinus contra legem. *Morbus igitur est proprie et conditio:* morbus, quia, sicut ille ex amore sui lapsus est, ita et nos labimur; conditio, quia, sicut ille servus est factus et morti obnoxius, sic et nos servi et filii iræ nascimur et morti obnoxii. (An illustration of servants who are made prisoners of war with their masters, but *without guilt of their own.*) Comp. *Zwingli,* De Peccato originali, ad Urbanum Rhegium, Opera, iii. p. 627 ss. P. 628: Quid enim brevius aut clarius dici potuit quam originale peccatum non esse peccatum, sed morbum, et Christianorum liberos propter morbum istum non addici æterno supplicio? Contra vero, quid imbecillius dici potuit et a canonica scriptura alienus, quam . . . non tantum esse morbum, sed etiam reatum? P. 629: Morbi autem vocabulo hic . . . utimur . . . quatenus cum vitio conjunctus est eoque perpetuo, ut genti alicui translatitium est balbutire, cœcutire, podagra laborare. Quod malum naturalem defectum solemus germanice "*ein natürlichen Bresten*" appellare, quo nemo vel pejor vel sceleratior existimatur; non enim possunt in crimen aut culpam rapi, quæ natura adsunt. Si ergo diximus originalem contagionem *morbum* esse, non *peccatum,* quod peccatum cum culpa conjunctum est; culpa vero ex commisso vel admisso ejus nascitur, qui facinus designavit. (Example of one born in slavery.) Compare his work, Vom Kindertouf (Pædobaptism), Werke, ii. 1, s. 287 ff.: "Original sin is nothing but a natural defect derived from Adam . . . such a defect (*Brest*) as one has by birth, or acquires from any

accident." "*The difference*," says *Schweizer*, i. s. 46, "*of Zwingli's view from the common one is in fact of no great moment*" (?). One of the chief differences is this, that Zwingli does not view original sin as *imputed* to man; that original sin, *as such*, is not under *condemnation*. Compare the further passages, and the defence of Zwingli from the reformed side (*e.g. Pictet*), in *Schweizer*, l.c., and on the other side, *Schenkel*, ii. s. 29 ff. As to the extent to which Zwingli put the essence of sin in the bodily constitution (the flesh), see ibid. s. 34. At any rate, with all the Reformers, he held to the absolute sinfulness and condemnation of man in the sight of *God;* see his treatise "On Divine and Human Justice" (Werke, i. s. 465): "*We are all criminals before God* . . . and as our crimes are known to God alone, so He alone judges them. . . . I call human righteousness a poor defective righteousness, because a man may well be just and esteemed before men, who is not just in the sight of God; for no man is just before God; . . . it is not possible for a man to be inwardly pious, pure, and clean, according to divine righteousness." Hence he is no Pelagian! *Calvin* is here intermediate between Luther and Zwingli. Inst. ii. 1, § 6 (ed. Gen. 1530): Non aliter interpretari licet quod dicitur, nos in Adam mortuos esse, quam quod ipse peccando non sibi tantum cladem ac ruinam ascivit sed naturam quoque nostram in simile præcipitavit exitium. Neque id suo unius vitio, quod nihil ad nos pertineat, sed quoniam universum suum semen ea, in quam lapsus erat vitiositate, infecit. . . . Sic ergo se corrupit Adam, ut ab eo transierit in totam sobolem contagio, etc. § 8: Videtur ergo peccatum originale hereditaria naturæ nostræ pravitas et corruptio in omnes animæ partes diffusa. . . . Quare qui peccatum originale definierunt carentiam justitiæ originalis, quam inesse nobis oportebat, quamquam id totum complectuntur, quod in re est, non tamen satis significanter vim atque energiam ipsius expresserunt. Non enim natura nostra bona tantum inops et vacua est, sed malorum omnium adeo fertilis et ferax, ut otiosa esse non possit. Qui dixerunt, esse concupiscentiam, non nimis alieno verbo usi sunt, si modo adderetur (quod minime conceditur a plerisque), quidquid in homine est, ab intellectu ad voluntatem, ab anima ad carnem usque, hac concupiscentia inquinatum refertumque esse, aut, ut brevius absolvatur, *totum hominem*

non aliud ex se ipso esse quam concupiscentiam. That sounds like Flacianism; but see also § 11: A natura fluxisse (peccatum) negamus, ut significemus *adventitiam* magis esse qualitatem, quæ homini *acciderit*, quam *substantialem* proprietatem, quam ab initio induerit. Vocamus tamen naturalem, ne quis ab unoquoque prava consuetudine comparari putet, quam hæreditario jure universos comprehensos teneat. § 9: Neque enim appetitus tantum eum (Adamum) illexit, sed arcem ipsam mentis occupavit nefanda impietas et ad cor intimum penetravit superbia, ut frigidum sit ac stultum, corruptelam, quæ inde manavit, ad sensuales tantum, ut vocant, motus restringere. Comp. *Schenkel*, ii. s. 37 ff.

(2) As regards *the Symbolical Books of the Lutheran Church*, see Confessio August. Art. 2: Docent, quod post lapsum Adæ omnes homines, secundum naturam propagati, nascantur cum peccato, h. e. sine metu Dei, sine fiducia erga Deum et cum concupiscentia, quoque hic morbus seu vitium originis vere sit peccatum, damnans et afferens nunc quoque æternam mortem his, qui non renascuntur per baptismum et Spir. S. Damnant Pelagianos et alios, qui vitium originis negant esse peccatum, et, ut extenuent gloriam meriti et beneficiorum Christi, disputant hominem propriis viribus rationis coram Deo justificari posse. Comp. Apol. Art. 1, 5, Art. Smalcald. p. 317: Peccatum hæreditarium tam profunda et tetra est corruptio naturæ, ut nullius hominis ratione intelligi possit, sed ex Scripturæ patefactione agnoscenda et credenda sit. Formula Conc. p. 574: Credimus peccatum originis non esse levem, sed tam profundam humanæ naturæ corruptionem, quæ nihil sanum, nihil incorruptum in corpore et anima hominis, atque adeo in interioribus et exterioribus viribus ejus, reliquit.—According to p. 640, nothing is left to man but impotentia et ineptitudo, *ἀδυναμία* et stupiditas, qua homo ad omnia divina seu spiritualia sit prorsus ineptus. . . . In aliis enim externis hujus mundi rebus, quæ rationi subjectæ sunt, relictum est homini adhuc aliquid intellectus, virium, et facultatum, etsi hæ etiam miseræ reliquiæ valde sunt debiles, et quidem hæc ipsa quantulacunque per morbum illum hæreditarium veneno infecta sunt atque contaminata, ut coram Deo nullius momenti sint. Respecting *the Symbolical Books of the Reformed Church*, comp. Confess. Basil. I. Art. 2: He (man) has wilfully committed sin, and by his fall

brought corruption upon the whole human race, exposed it to condemnation, weakened our nature, and introduced such a tendency to sin, that if the Holy Spirit does not restore it, man by himself neither will nor can do good. Conf. Helv. II. 8: Peccatum autem intelligimus esse nativam illam hominis corruptionem ex primis nostris parentibus in nos omnes derivatam vel propagatam, qua concupiscentiis pravis immersi et a bono aversi, ad omne vero malum propensi, pleni omni nequitia, diffidentia, contemtu, et odio Dei, nihil boni ex nobis ipsis facere, imo ne cogitare quidem possumus. Cap. 9: . . . Non sublatus est quidem homini intellectus, *non erepta ei voluntas* et prorsus in lapidem vel truncum est commutatus. Ceterum illa ita sunt immutata et imminuta in homine, ut non possint amplius, quod potuerunt ante lapsum. Intellectus enim obscuratus est, *voluntas vero ex libera facta est voluntas serva.* Nam servit peccato, non nolens sed volens. Etenim voluntas, non noluntas dicitur. *Ergo quoad malum sive peccatum* homo non coactus vel a Deo, vel a Diabolo, sed *sua sponte* malum facit et *hac parte liberrimi est arbitrii.* . . . Quantum vero ad bonum et ad virtutes, intellectus hominis non recte judicat de divinis ex semet ipso. Heidelberg Catechism, *Quest.* 7: By the fall and disobedience of our first parents, our nature has been so corrupted that we are all conceived and born in sins. *Quest.* 8. But are we so corrupt that we are wholly incapable of anything that is good, and inclined to do all that is evil? *Ans.* Yes, unless we be regenerated by the Spirit of God.[1] Comp. Conf. Gall. c. 9, Angl. 9, Belg. 15: (Peccatum orig.) est totius naturæ corruptio et vitium hæreditarium, quo et ipsi infantes in matris suæ utero polluti sunt, quodque veluti radix omne peccatorum genus in homine producit ideoque ita fœdum et exsecrabile est coram Deo, ut ad generis humani condemnationem sufficiat. Canon. Dord. c. 3, Art. 1, Form. Cons. 10: Censemus igitur, peccatum Adami omnibus ejus posteris, judicio Dei arcano et justo, imputari. 11: Duplici igitur nomine post peccatum homo natura, indeque ab ortu suo, antequam ullum actuale peccatum in se admittat, iræ ac maledictioni divinæ obnoxius est: primum quidem ob *παράπτωμα* et inobedientiam, quam in Adami lumbis commisit; deinde ob consequentem in

[1] On the controversies to which this proposition afterwards gave rise, see *Becklaus*, l.c. s. 57 (A.D. 1583, it was opposed by the Dutch theologian *Coornhert*).

ipso conceptu hæreditariam corruptionem insitam, qua tota ejus natura depravata et spiritualiter mortua est, adeo quidem, ut recte peccatum originale statuatur duplex, imputatum videlicet et hæreditarium inhærens. [Engl. Art. 9: Of Original or Birth-sin: Original sin standeth not in the following of *Adam* (as the *Pelagians* do vainly talk), but in the fault and corruption of the Nature of every man that naturally is engendered of the offspring of *Adam;* whereby man is very far gone from original righteousness, and is of his own nature inclined to evil, so that the flesh lusteth always contrary to the spirit; and therefore in every person born into this world, it deserveth God's wrath and damnation. And this infection of nature doth remain, yea in them that are regenerate; whereby the lust of the flesh, called in the Greek *phronema sarkos*, which some do expound the wisdom, some sensuality, some the affection, some the desire, of the flesh, is not subject to the Law of God. And although there is no condemnation for them that believe and are baptized, yet the apostle doth confess that concupiscence and lust hath of itself the nature of sin.—The Westminster Confession, chapter vi. 3: They [our first parents] being the root of all mankind, the guilt of this [their first] sin was imputed, and the same death in sin and corrupted nature conveyed to all their posterity, descending from them by ordinary generation.]

(3) The Roman Catholics also rejected pure Pelagianism, Conc. Trid., Sess. v. 1, 2: Si quis Adæ prævaricationem sibi soli et non ejus propagini asserit nocuisse, et acceptam a Deo sanctitatem et justitiam, quam perdidit, sibi soli et non nobis etiam eum perdidisse, aut inquinatum illum per inobedientiæ peccatum mortem et pœnas corporis tantum in omne genus humanum transfudisse, *non autem et* peccatum, quod mors est animæ: anathema sit. Sess. vi. c. 1, it is taught that the free will of man is, by the fall, weakened and turned aside (attenuatum et inclinatum); on the other hand, it is maintained, in terms quite as decided, Can. 5: Si quis liberum hominis arbitrium post Adæ peccatum amissum et extinctum esse dixerit . . . anathema sit. Comp. Cat. Rom. 3. 10, 6, and especially *Bellarmine*, De Amiss. Gratiæ.

(4) Apol. Conf. Remonstr. p. 84*b* (in *Winer*, s. 59): Peccatum originale nec habent (Remonstrantes) pro peccato

proprie dicto, quod posteros Adami odio Dei dignos faciat, nec pro malo, quod per modum proprie dictæ pœnæ ab Adamo in posteros dimanet, sed pro malo, infirmitate, vitio, aut quocunque tandem alio nomine vocetur, quod ab Adamo justitia originali privato in posteros ejus propagatur: unde fit, ut posteri omnes Adami, eadem justitia destituti, prorsus inepti et inidonei sint ad vitam æternam consequendum, aut in gratiam cum Deo redeant, nisi Deus nova gratia sua eos præveniat, et vires novas iis restituat ac sufficiat, quibus ad eam possint pervenire. . . . Peccatum autem originis non esse malum culpæ proprie dictæ, quod vocant, ratio manifesta arguit: malum culpæ non est, quia nasci plane involuntarium est, ergo et nasci cum hac aut illa labe, infirmitate, vitio, vel malo. Si malum culpæ non est, non potest esse malum pœnæ, quia culpa et pœna sunt relata. Comp. *Limborch*, Theol. Christ. 3. 4. 4, and other passages quoted by *Winer*, s. 60 f.

(5) Cat. Racov. p. 21 (*Winer*, s. 57): Homo morti est obnoxius, quod primus homo apertum Dei mandatum, cui adjuncta fuit mortis comminatio, transgressus fuit. Unde porro factum est, ut universam suam posteritatem secum in eadem mortis jura traxerit, accedente tamen cujusvis in adultioribus proprio delicto, cujus deinde vis per apertam Dei legem, quam homines transgressi fuerant, aucta est.—Cat. Rac., Qu. 423 (*Winer*, s. 59): Peccatum originis nullum prorsus est. Nec enim e Scriptura id peccatum originis doceri potest, et lapsus Adæ, cum unus actus fuerit, vim eam, quæ depravare ipsam naturam Adami, multo minus vero posterorum ejus posset, habere non potuit. — *Faust. Socinus*, De Christo Serv. 4. 6 (Opp. ii. p. 226): Falluntur egregie, qui peccatum illud originis imputatione aliqua pro ea parte, quæ ad reatum spectat, contineri autumant, cum omnis reatus ex sola generis propagatione fluat. Gravius autem multo labuntur, qui pro ea parte, quæ ad corruptionem pertinet, ex pœna ipsius delicti Adami illud fluxisse affirmant. . . . Corruptio nostra et ad peccandum proclivitas non ex uno illo delicto in nos propagata est, sed continuatis actibus habitus modo hujus modo illius vitii est comparatus, quo naturam nostram corrumpente ea corruptio deinde per generis propagationem in nos est derivata. Neque vero si Adamus non deliquisset, propterea vel nos a peccatis immunes fuissemus, vel in hanc naturæ corruptionem incurrere

non potuissemus, dummodo, ut ille habuit, sic nos quoque voluntatem ad malum liberam habuissemus.—Prælectt. Theol. c. 4: Cæterum cupiditas ista mala, quæ cum plerisque hominibus nasci dici potest, non ex peccato illo primi parentis manat, sed ex eo, quod humanum genus frequentibus peccatorum actibus habitum peccandi contraxit et seipsum corrupit: quæ corruptio per propagationem in posteros transfunditur. Etenim unum illud peccatum per se non modo universos posteros, sed ne ipsum quidem Adamum corrumpendi vim habere potuit. Dei vero consilio, in peccati illius pœnam id factum esse nec usquam legitur et plane incredibile est imo impium id cogitare, Deum videlicit omnis rectitudinis auctorem ulla ratione pravitatis causam esse: quæ tamen pravitas, quatenus, ut dictum est, per propagationem in hominem derivatur, peccatum proprie appellari nequit. . . . Concludimus igitur, nullum, improprie etiam loquendo, peccatum originale esse, *i.e.* ex peccato illo primi parentis nullam labem aut pravitatem universo humano generi necessario ingenitam esse sive inflictam quodammodo fuisse, nec aliud malum ex primo illo delicto ad posteros omnes necessario manasse, quam moriendi omnimodam necessitatem, non quidem ex ipsius delicti vi, sed quia, cum jam homo natura mortalis esset, ob delictum illud suæ naturali mortalitati a Deo relictus est, quodque naturale erat, id in delinquentis pœnam prorsus necessarium est factum. Quare qui ex ipso nascuntur, eadem conditione omnes nasci oportet: nihil enim illi ademtum fuit, quod naturaliter haberet vel habiturus esset.—Comp. Opp. i. p. 334*b*: Vita æterna donum Dei est singulare et excellentissimum, quod nihil cum natura hominis commune habet (comp. § 245, note 6), aut certe ei nulla ratione naturaliter debetur. Ipsius autem hominis perpetua dissolutio ei naturalis est, ut mitissimus existimandus sit Deus, *si homini delinquenti* eam pœnæ loco constituit. Nam quid illi vel boni aufert, vel mali infert, si eum naturæ ipsius propriæ relinquit, et a se ex terra creatum atque compactum in terram rursus reverti ac dissolvi sinit. Hoc adeo rationi per se consentaneum est, ut pœna quodammodo dici non possit. Comp. *Fock*, s. 498, 654 ff.

§ 247.

Antagonisms within the Confessions.

But differences of opinion also manifested themselves among theologians belonging to the same Confessions. In the Lutheran Church, *Matthias Flacius* carried the Protestant doctrine to an extreme which bordered on heresy, holding that original sin was of the substance of man, while *Victorin Strigel* regarded it only as accidens (1). Among the theologians of the age of the Reformation there were not wanting, on the other hand, those who held to views that volatilized the essence of sin (2); and in respect to the doctrine of original sin, some of the later theologians of the Reformed Church, as those of the school of *Saumur*, especially *Josua de la Place*, manifested a disposition to adopt the milder views of the Arminians (3). On the other hand, in the Roman Catholic Church, the *Jansenists* returned to the stricter views of Augustine (4).

(1) On the controversy, see *Planck*, Geschichte des protestantischen Lehrbegriffs, v. 1, s. 285 ff. [comp. *Laidlaw*, Bible Doctrine of Man, Edin. 1879]; the Dissert. of *Otto* and *Twesten* (above § 215. 7, 5); and *Schmid* in Illgens Zeitschrift, 1849, 2. The views of Flacius are principally brought out in the work, "Clavis Scripturæ," and the appended treatise, De Peccato Originali; then in the book, De Peccati Originalis Essentia, Basil. 1568. See p. 655: Hoc igitur modo sentio et assero, primarium peccatum originale esse substantiam, quia anima rationalis et præsertim ejus nobilissimæ substantiales potentiæ—nempe intellectus et voluntas—quæ antea erant ita præclare formatæ, ut essent vera imago Dei fonsque omnis justitiæ, honestatis, ac pietatis, et plane essentialiter veluti aureæ et gemmeæ, nunc sunt fraude Satanæ adeo prorsus inversæ, ut sint vera ac viva imago Satanæ, et sint veluti stercoreæ, aut potius ex gehennali flamma constantes. See further in *Schenkel*, ii. s. 44; and *Heppe*, Gesch. d. deutschen

Protestantismus, ii. s. 395 ff.—On this point the authors of the Formula Concordiæ expressed themselves as follows, p. 285: Etsi peccatum originale totam hominis naturam, ut spirituale quoddam venenum et horribilis lepra ... infecit et corrupit ... tamen non unum et idem est corrupta natura seu substantia corrupti hominis, corpus et anima, aut homo ipse a Deo creatus, in quo originale peccatum habitat ... et ipsum originale peccatum, quod in hominis natura aut essentia habitat eamque corrumpit. In like manner the body of a person infected with leprosy, and the disease itself, are two different things. The theologians of the Reformed Church also rejected the views of Flacius; see *J. H. Heidegger*, Corpus Theol. Christ. x. 40 (ed. Tig. 1700, p. 346). This Flacian opinion may, in its opposition to Pelagianism, be termed *Manichœan*, inasmuch as it converts the moral element in the idea of sin into a merely physical one. Accordingly, Heidegger calls it l. c. Manichæismus incrustatus.

(2) Thus *Sebastian Frank* finds the essence of sin in ignorance and folly, and, in general, views it in a negative aspect; see *Schenkel*, ii. s. 60 ff. Similar views were held by *Occhino, Thamer, Münzer*, and others; ibid. s. 70 ff.

(3) *Josua Placœus*, Theses Theologicæ de Statu Hom. lapsi ante Gratiam, 1640, and Disput. de Imputatione primi peccati Adami, Salmur. 1655. He only admitted a mediate imputation of the sin of Adam, but not an immediate one; the opposite view was defended in the Formula Consensus.

(4) See *Reuchlin*, Port-Royal, s. 342 ff. Appendix, vii. s. 753 ff.

In respect to individual sins, Protestantism rejected their arbitrary classification after the scholastic style. The real mortal sin, in the Protestant view, is *unbelief*, which Luther calls the "many-headed and many-footed rat-king among the sins" (*Walch*, iv. 1075 ff.); *Schenkel*, ii. s. 73 f.

In connection with their rigid views concerning the nature and origin of sin, the Protestants could not but reject the notion of *the immaculate conception of Mary;* that they for some time retained the epithets pura et intemerata virgo (Conf. Bas. l.), and others, proves nothing in regard to the doctrine; comp. Declaratio Thoruniensis (quoted by *Augusti*, pp. 415 and 416): Omnes homines, solo Christo excepto, in peccato originali concepti et nati sunt, etiam ipsa *sanctissima* Virgo Maria.—But even in the Roman Catholic Church the doctrine continued to meet opponents; and neither the Council of Trent, nor Bellarmine, nor some of the later popes (*e.g.* Gregory xv. and Alexander vii.) ventured to define it. Comp. *Winer*, s. 57, note 2. *Augusti*, Archäologie, III. s. 100. See, however, the next period.

§ 248.

Further Development of the Doctrine in Theology and Life.

The anthropology of the Protestant Church was more fully developed both in practical life and by the writings of the schools. In the spirit of the earlier scholasticism, the Lutheran and Reformed theologians alike entered into inquiries respecting the creation of man (1), the propagation of the race (Creatianism and Traducianism) (2), the nature of the fall (3), of original sin (4), and of actual sin (5). The sense of sin and moral inability, as well as the consciousness of freedom, continued to manifest themselves in practical life, though, in reference to the former, the definitions of the schools, and the bigoted zeal which *Calov* displayed in his controversy with *Calixt* and his followers (6), hardened it into a dead letter. On the other hand, the *Pietists* again emphasized the importance of the practical bearing of the doctrine of human corruption, and yet insisted none the less upon the strictest injunctions of morality (7). This was also the case with the *Jansenists* in the Roman Catholic Church (8), while the Pelagianizing principles of the *Jesuits* were favourable to a looser morality (9).

(1) The assertion that there had been human beings before the creation of Adam (*Preadamites*) was occasioned by a short controversy in the Reformed Church. *Isaac Peyrerius* (de la Peyrère), a Huguenot, who had become a convert to Romanism, and died A.D. 1676, as one of the priests of the Oratory, wrote in 1655 a work entitled: De Præadamitis. Comp. *Bayle*, Dictionnaire, iii. p. 637 s. His notion was opposed by *Calov*, iii. p. 1049, who called it "monstrosa opinio;" *Quenstedt*, i. p. 733 ss., and *Hollaz*, p. 406. The common definition of man, given in the works on systematic theology, was, that he is an animal rationale. Most of the writers adopted the dichotomistic principle, according to which man consists of body and soul. Thus *Hollaz* says, P. i. c. 5, qu. 6 (p. 410): Homo constat e duabus partibus, anima rationali et corpore

organico; other definitions are given by *Hase*, Hutterus Redivivus, s. 192.—*John Gerhard* sees in man an image of the Trinity; Loci Theol. tom. iv. loc. ix. § 6. Comp. above, § 245, note 3, on the image of God. On God's breathing the breath of life into man's nostrils, comp. *Gerhard*, Loci Theol. loc. i. § 12 (quoted by *De Wette*, Dogmatik, s. 89): Non ex intimo ore suæ essentiæ spirat Deus animam hominis, sicut Spiritum S. ab omni æternitate intra divinam essentiam Pater cum Filio spirat, sed animam in tempore extra suam essentiam creatam homini inspiravit.

(2) *Luther* taught traducianism, followed by the Lutheran divines, with the exception of *Calixt* (De Animæ Creatione). *Gerhard* very properly left it to philosophers (ix. 8, § 118) to define the modus propagationis; but he himself taught, § 116: . . . Animas eorum, qui ex Adamo et Eva progeniti fuissent, non creatas, neque etiam generatas, sed propagatas fuisse. Similar views were expressed by *Calov*, iii. p. 1081; and *Hollaz*, i. 5, qu. 9 (p. 414 s.): Anima humana hodie non immediate creatur, sed mediante semine fœcundo a parentibus generatur et in liberos traducitur. . . . Non generatur anima *ex* traduce, sine semine fœcundo, tamquam principio materiali, sed *per* traducem, seu mediante semine prolifico tamquam vehiculo, propagatur.—Comp. the Consensus Repetitus Fidei veræ Luth., Punct. 22 (in *Henke*, p. 18): Profitemur et docemus, hominem generare hominem, idque non tantum quoad corpus, sed etiam animam. Rejicimus eos, qui docent, in hominibus singulis animas singulas non ex propagine oriri, sed ex nihilo tunc primum creari atque infundi, cum in uteris matrum fœtus concepti atque ad animationem præparati sunt.—On the contrary, *Bellarmine*, *Calvin*, and the theologians of the Reformed Church in general, advocated the theory of Creatianism, retaining at the same time the doctrine of original sin. *Calvin*, indeed, did not attach so much importance to such statements as the earlier scholastics (Instit. ii. 1, 7): Neque ad ejus rei intelligentiam necessaria est anxia disputatio, quæ veteres non parum torsit; but he continued as follows: Neque in substantia carnis aut animæ causam habet contagio, sed quia a Deo ita fuit ordinatum. *Beza* rejects traducianism in the most decided manner, Qu. 47: Doctrina de animæ traduce mihi perabsurda videtur, quoniam

aut totam animam aut partem ejus traduci oporteret.—Comp. *Peter Martyr*, Thesis 705: Animæ non sunt omnes simul creatæ ab initio, sed creantur quotidie a Deo corporibus inserendæ.—*Polanus*, p. 2183: Eodem momento Deus creat animam simul et unit corpori infecto.—*Bucanus*, p. 92: Quod totum genus humanum ab Adamo corruptum est, non tam ex genitura provenit . . . quam ex justa Dei vindicta. Other passages are quoted by *De Wette*, Dogmatik, s. 89. *Schweizer*, i. s. 452 ff.

(3) The fall of our first parents was called peccatum originans, in distinction from original sin (peccatum originale, originatum). The causa externa, prima et principalis, was Satan, the causa instrumentalis was the serpent, by which we are to understand a real serpent possessed with the devil. *Gerhard*, Loc. x. § 8, p. 295, endeavours to reconcile the too literal interpretation of *Josephus* (Antiq. 3. 1) with the allegorizing exposition of *Philo* (De Mundi Opif. f. 46) by saying: Nos nec nudum, nec mere allegoricum, sed diabolo obsessum ac stipatum serpentem hic describi statuimus. (He proves this at some length from the twofold nature of the serpent, and the curse pronounced upon the devil no less than upon the serpent.) Compare the passages from other theologians in *De Wette*, s. 94; and in *Hase*, Hutterus Redivivus, p. 202.—The Reformed theologians entered into similar investigations. This was the case, *e.g.*, with *Heidegger*, x. 10 ff. In ch. 14 he describes the μεθοδεία tentationis satanicæ, and then proceeds, in the subsequent chapters (especially ch. 18), to measure out the guilt of man. The fall of Adam was not particularis, but generalis: . . . Non simplex, sed concatenatum peccatum fuit, et universæ legis, amoris Dei et proximi violationem involvit. He transgressed the laws both of the first and second table. His guilt was considerably increased, partly because, having received so many blessings from the hand of God, he could have no inducement to sin, partly because the command was in itself easy to be complied with. Other circumstances also, such as time and place (*i.e.* his recent creation and his abode in paradise), added to his guilt, as well as his high office in his capacity as the father of the human race. Accedit, quod (peccatum Adæ) radix fuit omnium peccatorum et velut equus Trojanus, ex cujus utero et iliis innumera peccata omniumque malorum Ilias prodierunt, ut gravissimum hoc peccatum et

apostasiam a Deo vivente fuisse dubitari nullo modo possit. In ch. 19 he examines, after the example of the scholastics, the question whether Adam had the greater guilt, or Eve, which he thus decides: Nobis Scriptura utcunque innuere videtur, gravius peccasse Adamum, cum non tam Evæ, quam Adami peccatum accuset (Rom. v. 12; 1 Cor. xv. 22). In ch. 20 he treats of the share which God had in the sin: Nec Deus spectator otiosus fuit. Nam *ante* peccatum tum lege illud vetuit, tum comminatione ab eo hominem deterruit. *In* peccato et explorationis causa hominem sibi reliquit, et patrato jam ab Eva peccato, oculos ejusdem ad agnoscendam nuditatem prius non aperuit, quam Adam etiam peccasset. *Post* illud immediate judicium in peccatores exercuit . . . et in remedium peccati Christum προκεχειροτονημένον revelavit. Nevertheless he modestly adds: In modo, quem divina providentia circa peccatum adhibuit, explicando cogitationes et linguæ nostræ ita frænandæ sunt, ut cogitemus semper Deum in cœlo esse, nos in terra, eum fabricatorem esse, nos ejus plasma. Cumque intelligere, quomodo creati simus, non valeamus, multo equidem minus intelligere possumus, quomodo facti ad imaginem Dei mutari potuerimus, *ut tamen non independenter homo egerit, et Deus malum non fecerit.* Comp. *Gerhard*, § 14 ss. § 25: Maneat ergo firmum fixum, Deum non decrevisse nec voluisse istum protoplastorum lapsum, nec impulisse eos ad peccatum, nec eo delectatum fuisse, etc.

(4) *Gerhard*, Loci, x. c. 3 ss. § 51: Per hominem victum tota natura corrupta est et quasi fermentata peccato. § 52: Peccatum illud (Adami) non est modis omnibus a nobis alienum, quia Adam non ut privatus homo, sed ut caput totius humani generis peccavit; atque ut natura humana per ipsum communicata fit propria cuique personæ ex ipso genitæ, sic et naturæ corruptio per propagationem communicatur. Ac proinde quemadmodum tribus Levitica inclusa lumbis Abrahæ decimas obtulisse Melchisedecho dicitur (Heb. vii. 9), ita et nos, qui in lumbis Adæ peccantis delituimus, in et cum ipso non modo corrupti, sed et rei iræ Dei facti sumus. His views are more fully developed, c. 5. — According to *Heidegger*, x. 44 ff., not only the potentiæ naturales (superiores: mens et voluntas; inferiores: sensitiva et vegetativa) are subject to corruption, but also the qualitates: conscience itself has be-

come erring, and the bodily organs are affected by the general corruption (Matt. v. 29, 30). On the nature of original sin it is said, c. 50: Neque peccatum originale merus reatus peccati alieni, neque concupiscentia sola proprie neque nuda justitiæ carentia est. Sed *late* acceptum peccati alieni imputatione, et labe omnibus facultatibus inhærente, easque tum a bono avertente, tum ad malum convertente, quam utramque distinctus reatus sequitur; *stricte* vero pro solo eo, quod nascentibus seu orientibus inest, labe ea facultatibus insita, quam etiam proprius reatus sequitur, constat. Cum enim peccatum pertineat ad facultates hominis, ab iis non est discedendum. Itaque cum peccatum originis non pertineat ad opera, quæ a facultatibus illis procedunt, neque est in ipsis illis, ceu spiritualis quædam lepra hæreat. For the views of other Reformed divines, see *Schweizer*, s. 54 ff.

(5) Sin was defined as illegalitas seu difformitas a lege divina, or as defectus vel inclinatio vel actio pugnans cum lege Dei, offendens Deum, damnata a Deo, et faciens reos æternæ iræ et æternarum pœnarum, nisi sit facta remissio. By the *contingence* of sin was understood the (abstract) possibility of its being or not being, in distinction from (physical) necessity. A distinction was made between peccatum originale (habituale) and actuale; and actual sins were further divided into peccata voluntaria et involuntaria, into peccata commissionis et omissionis,[1] into peccata interiora et exteriora, or, peccata cordis, oris, et operis, etc. Comp. *Gerhard*, Loci, t. v. ab initio. *Heidegger*, c. 52 ss., and other passages quoted by *De Wette*, l.c., and *Heppe*, s. 371 ff.

(6) The views of *Calixt*, which he held at an early period of his life, were laid down in a collected form in his Dissertat. de Peccato (written A.D. 1611); see *G. Calixti*, De præcipuis Christianæ Religionis Capitibus Disputationes XV., ed. a *F. U. Calixto*, Helmst. 1658, 4to, Disput. V. He combated Traducianism (comp. above, note 2), and deduced from it the following positions:—Thes. 33: Quare peccatum originis in nobis non est ipsa culpa a parentibus commissa, et quia culpa non est, nec est reatus, quum aperte quoque scriptum sit (Ezech.

[1] There were special investigations respecting the *Sin against the Holy Ghost*, as being "tristissima species peccati mortalis." *Gerhard*, Loci Theol. v. p. 84. *Quenstedt*, ii. p. 80. *Gass*, s. 360.

xviii. 20): Filius non portabit iniquitatem patris, si videlicet ipse eam non adprobet aut imitetur. Thes. 56: Vera et sincera est sententia, quam proposuimus, quod scilicet peccatum originis non sit ipsa culpa Adæ, nec sit reatus consequens culpam, verum pravitas naturæ, non tamen sine relatione ad primam culpam, cujus est tamquam effectus immediate consequens. . . . Hæret itaque in nobis aliquid, et peccatum originale dicitur, quod non est ipsa illa prima Adæ prævaricatio, sed aliquid aliud ab ipsa manans. Thes. 57: Optime autem cognoscitur ex opposita integritate, quæ sicuti in intellectu erat cognitio, in voluntate amor et pronitas ad benefaciendum, in adpetitu obsequium et concordia cum superioribus facultatibus, ita pravitas hæc in intellectu est ignorantia, in voluntate pronitas ad malefaciendum, in adpetitu rebellio. Thes. 58: Et sicuti in integritate sive ad imaginem Dei conditus erat homo, ita nunc in pravitate sive ad imaginem Adæ gignitur. Thes. 59: Et sicuti homo si non peccasset, integritas naturam humanam semper et inseparabiliter consequuta fuisset, et una cum illa ad posteros propagata, ita, postquam homo peccavit, pravitas eam concomitatur et propagatur. Thes. 60: Et sicuti integritas fuisset tamquam actus primus, actus autem secundus ex illo primo natus, studium et exercitium integritatis, ita nunc pravitas ista connata est actus primus, actus autem secundus est pravitas pravum actum producens. Thes. 93 (in which he opposes Flacius), he says: Pejor autem hæresis quam Manichæorum, adserere, substantiam humanam esse peccatum, et hanc nihilominus a Deo propagari et conservari. Ita enim peccatum a Deo propagabitur et conservabitur, et Deus O. M. auctor peccati constituetur. In Thes. 88, and in some other places, Calixt maintained (like *Strigel*) that original sin is an accidens.—*Lakermann* (who lived in Königsberg from 1644 to 1646), a disciple of Calixt, asserted in one of his theses: Quod gratia Dei ita offertur, ut, ea oblata, in hominis potestate sit, per illam ea, quæ ad conversionem et salutem necessaria sint, præstare; in another: Omnes, si velint, possunt se convertere; further: Solum peccatum originale post lapsum adæquata causa damnationis esse non potest. Such sentiments were, in the opinion of Prof. *Mislenta*, gross and dangerous errors. Thus the signal was given for a general controversy, in which *Calixt* himself and his colleague *Conrad Hornejus*

took part. In consequence of the efforts made by *Calov*, the views of Calixt and his adherents were condemned (A.D. 1655) in the Consensus Repetitus Fidei veræ Lutheranæ, in which the Lutheran doctrine of original sin was set forth in the most rigid terms. Thus, in particular, Punct. 23–29 (in *Henke*, p. 18 ss.). For the passages, see *Neudecker* (Fortsetzung von *Münscher, von Cölln*), s. 440. On the controversy in general, comp. *Planck*, Geschichte der protestantischen Theologie, s. 107 ff. *Gass*, Georg Calixt und der Synkretismus, 1846, s. 68 ff., s. 98 ff. *Schmid*, s. 185.

(7) In the case of *Spener*, as in that of Luther, personal experience led him to his doctrine respecting sin; thus it happened that in his system *sin* and *repentance* are closely connected with each other. He does not wait till his views of sin become cold and indifferent, but he strikes, as it were, the iron made red-hot in the furnace of inward experience while it retains its heat. Compare his Theologische Bedenken (edit. by *Hennicke*), s. 33 ff.—Nor, when he published (1687) his first treatise, in Saxony, under the title, "Natur und Gnade," was it his intention to present a theoretical contrast between nature and grace in a scientific way; but, his object being practical, he adopted popular forms of statement, and did not present the antagonism in all its sharpness. See *Hossbach*, i. s. 257. But even his very zeal for sanctification was represented and opposed by the orthodox as a perversion of sound doctrine.

(8) Both Pietism and Jansenism prove that the system of Augustine, though often charged with enfeebling the moral power of man, nevertheless produces deeper and more lasting effects than Pelagianism; and that the charge of its undermining morality and paralysing the will cannot be admitted, at least in that universality of application in which it is commonly advanced. The motto of Jansenism here holds good: Dei servitus, vera libertas.

(9) Compare *Pascal's* Lettres Provinciales. *Reuchlin*, Port-Royal, s. 33 ff., 631 ff.

B.—THE DOCTRINE OF SALVATION.

§ 249.

Freedom and Grace. Predestination. (According to the different Confessions.)

[*Heppe*, Dogmatik der evangel. Ref. Kirche, 1861. *J. B. Mozley*, Doctrine of Predestination, 1855. *Winer*, Comparative Darstellung, u.s.w., u.s.]

Notwithstanding the religious conflicts to which the Reformation gave rise, it remained the common belief of all Christians, that the felicity of man depends on the gracious decree of God (1). But they differed on the question, whether this divine decree is unconditional or depends on the conduct of man, whether it is general or particular. The more rigid the views of theologians on the doctrine of original sin and the moral inability of man, the more firmly they would maintain that the decree of God was unconditional. Hence it is not surprising that Roman Catholics (2), Arminians (3), and most of all the Socinians (4), endeavoured in a more or less Pelagian manner to satisfy the claims of human freedom. On the other hand, both Lutherans and Reformed, following Augustine, rejected the notion of the freedom of the will, and denied all co-operation on the part of man (5). Nevertheless, it is a striking fact that the Lutherans avoided the strict consequences of the Augustinian system, and asserted that the decrees of God are conditional, *propter prævisam fidem* (6); while the Reformed theologians not only admitted the necessity of those consequences (7), but, having once determined the idea of predestination, went beyond the premisses so far as to maintain that the fall of man itself was predestinated by God (Supralapsarianism) (8). But this view, so far from meeting with general approbation, was at last almost entirely abandoned to make way for the opposite opinion of Infralapsarianism or Sublapsarianism (9). As regards the extent of the

offered grace, all the confessions, with the exception of the Reformed, held to universalism (10), in distinction from particularism; but even all Calvinists did not on this point go to the same length (11); some of them adopted the standpoint of the universality of the provisions of grace.

(1) Compare the passages quoted by *Winer*, s. 80 f.

(2) Conc. Trid., Sess. vi. can. 4: Si quis dixerit, liberum arbitrium a Deo motum et excitatum nihil cooperari assentiendo Deo excitanti atque vocanti, quo ad obtinendam justificationis gratiam se disponat ac præparet, neque posse dissentire, si velit, sed velut inanime quoddam nihil omnino agere, mereque passive se habere: anathema sit. Can. 17: Si quis justificationis gratiam nonnisi prædestinatis ad vitam contingere dixerit, reliquos vero omnes, qui vocantur, vocari quidem, sed gratiam non accipere, utpote divina potestate prædestinatos ad malum: anathema sit. The doctrine of the Roman Catholic Symbols was in so far decidedly opposed to the Pelagians, as the former maintained (Sess. vi. can. 3) that it is *God* who begins the work of conversion without any co-operation on the part of man; but they also asserted that afterwards the free-will must be added, and man co-operate in the work of sanctification. For further passages, see *Winer*, s. 84.—*Bellarmine* advances the following proposition (in opposition to the Pelagians, etc.) at the very commencement of his treatise, De Gratia et lib. Arbitr.: Auxilium gratiæ Dei non ita offertur omnibus hominibus, ut Deus expectet homines, qui illud desiderent vel postulent, sed prævenit omnia desideria et omnem invocationem. In ch. 2 he then proceeds to assert: Auxilium gratiæ Dei non æqualiter omnibus adest. Thus far he agrees with the Protestants. He even adds, in ch. 3: Nulla esset in Deo iniquitas, si non solum aliquibus, sed etiam omnibus hominibus auxilium sufficiens ad salutem negaret. He likewise, in ch. 4, gives the practical caution (after the example of Augustine), not to doubt beforehand the salvation of any one, but to persevere in admonishing, etc. But in ch. 5 he converts this practical advice into the doctrinal theory: Auxilium sufficiens ad salutem pro loco et tempore, mediate vel immediate omnibus datur (a proposition which is somewhat limited and more fully discussed in the subsequent

chapters). And then in the sequel (in Books ii. and iii.) he endeavours to save the doctrine of free-will. In his view, free-will is not the condition of being free, but the power of choosing, and of forming purposes. It is neither actus nor habitus, but potentia, and in fact a potentia activa. On the co-operation of the free-will with the grace of God, he says, iv. c. 15: . . . Hinc sequitur, ut neque Deus determinet sive necessitet voluntatem, neque voluntas Deum. Nam et uterque concursum suum libere adhibet, et si alter nolit concurrere, opus non fiet. Simile est, cum duo ferunt ingentem lapidem, quem unus ferre non posset; neuter enim alteri vires addit, aut eum impellit, et utrique liberum est onus relinquere. Quamquam Deus, nisi extraordinarie miraculum operari velit, semper concurrit, quando voluntas nostra concurrit, quoniam ad hoc se libere quodam modo obligavit, quando liberam voluntatem creavit. Ex quo etiam sequitur, ut, licet in eodem prorsus momento temporis et naturæ Deus et voluntas operari incipiant, tamen Deus operetur, quia voluntas operatur, non contra. Et hoc est, quod aliqui dicunt, voluntatem prius natura operari quam Deum, non prioritate instantis *in* quo, sed *a* quo.—*On Predestination,* he thus expresses himself, ibid. p. 657: Deus ab æterno determinavit omnes effectus, sed non ante prævisionem determinationis causarum secundarum, præsertim contingentium et liberarum, et rursus determinavit omnes effectus, sed non eodem modo: alios enim determinavit futuros se operante vel co-operante, alios se permittente vel non impediente, etc.—Ib. p. 659: Deus, qui perfecte cognoscit omnes propensiones et totum ingenium animi nostri, et rursum non ignorat omnia, quæ illi possunt occurrere in singulis deliberationibus, et denique perspectum habet, quid majus congruum et aptum sit, moveat talem animum tali propensione et ingenio præditum, infallibiliter colligit, quam in partem animus sit inclinaturus.

(3) " *The Arminians suppose a constant co-operation of the human will, awakened by divine grace, with that grace; but in their opinion the influence of the latter is by no means merely of a moral nature; it is the power of the Holy Spirit accompanying the word of God* (Confess. Remonstr. 17. 2, 5), *which exerts an influence upon the mind, and is supernatural as regards its nature, but analogous to the natural power of all truth, as*

regards the mode of its operation." *Winer*, s. 86, where passages are quoted from the Confess. and Apol. Confess. Remonstr. Comp. also *Episcopii* Institutt. v. p. 5 ss. *Limborch*, Theologia Christ., lib. iv. ab init. cap. 12, § 15: Concludimus itaque, quod gratia divina, per Evangelium nobis revelata, sit principium, progressus, et complementum omnis salutaris boni, sine cujus cooperatione nullum salutare bonum ne cogitare quidem, multo minus perficere, possimus.—Cap. 14, § 21: . . . Gratia Dei primaria est fidei causa, sine qua non posset homo recte libero arbitrio uti. Perinde est, ac si duobus captivis carceri inclusis, et vinculis et compedibus arte constrictis, quidam superveniat, qui carcerem aperiat, vincula demat, et egrediendi facultatem largiatur, quin et manu apprehensa eos suaviter trahat et hortetur ut exeant; unus autem occasione hac commoda utatur, libertatemque oblatam apprehendat et e carcere egrediatur, alter vero beneficium istud liberationis contemnat et in carcere manere velit; nemo dicet illum libertatis suæ esse causam, non vero eum qui carcerem aperuit, eo quod aperto carcere, perinde uti alter, non egredi et in captivitate remanere potuit. Dices: Ergo liberum arbitrium *cooperatur* cum gratia? Resp.: Fatemur, alias nulla obedientia aut inobedientia hominis locum habet. Dices: An cooperatio liberi arbitrii non est bonum salutare? Resp.: Omnino. Dices: Ergo gratia non est primaria causa salutis? Resp.: Non est *solitaria*, sed tamen *primaria;* ipsa enim liberi arbitrii cooperatio est a gratia tamquam primaria causa: nisi enim a præveniente gratia liberum arbitrium excitatum esset, gratiæ cooperari non posset. Dices: Qui potestatem habet credendi, non salvatur, sed qui actu credit: cum itaque prius tantum sit a Deo, posterius a nobis, sequitur, nos nostri salvatores esse. Respondeo 1: Quoniam sine potestate credendi actu credere non possumus, sequitur eum, qui credendi potestatem largitus est, etiam actus fidei primariam esse causam. Unde et in Scriptura uni gratiæ plerumque fides et conversio nostra adscribi solet: quia . . . solenne est, opera magna et eximia adscribi causæ principali, minus principalium nulla sæpe mentione facta. Quod et hic usu venit, ut homo semper beneficii divini memor agnosceret se nullas ex seipso ad tantum bonum consequendum vires habere. Non tantum enim quod possimus velle, sed et quod actu velimus, gratiæ debetur, quæ

nos prævenit, excitat, et impellit ad volendum et agendum, ita tamen, ut possimus non velle. 2. Certo sensu concedi potest, hominem sui ipsius servatorem esse, Scriptura ipsa ab ejusmodi loquendi ratione non abhorrente. Phil. ii. 12.

(4) *Sebastian Frank, Servetus,* and others were the forerunners of this tendency; see *Schenkel,* Wesen des Protest. ii. s. 96 ff. But it was the *Socinians* whose views chiefly savoured of Pelagianism. Comp. Cat. Racov., Qu. 422: Estne liberum arbitrium situm in nostra potestate, ut Deo obtemperemus? Prorsus. Etenim certum est, primum, hominem ita a Deo conditum fuisse, ut libero arbitrio præditus esset. Nec vero ulla causa subest, cur Deus post ejus lapsum illum eo privaret. Other passages are given by *Winer.* Comp. also *F. Socinus,* Prælect. Theol. c. 5, and De libero Hom. Arbitrio deque æterna Dei Prædestinatione, scriptum, *J. J. Grynæo* oblatum (Opp. i. p. 780 s.). *Joh. Crellii* Ethica Christ. (Bibl. Fratr. Pol.) p. 262. The Socinians, like the Pelagians, supposed divine grace to consist especially in the external dispositions of God, not excluding its internal effects upon the mind. Cat. Rac., Qu. 428–430: Auxilium divinum duplex est: interius et exterius. (Exterius aux. div.) sunt promissa et minæ, quorum tamen promissa vim habent longe majorem. Unde etiam, quod sint sub novo fœdere longe præstantiora promissa, quam sub vetere fuerint, facilius est sub novo, quam sub vetere fœdere voluntatem Dei facere. (Interius auxil. div.) est id, cum Deus in cordibus eorum, qui ipsi obediunt, quod promisit (vitam æternam) obsignat.—Pag. 251 (of the revised edition): Spiritus Sanctus ejusmodi Dei afflatus est, quo animi nostri vel uberiore rerum divinarum notitia vel spe vitæ æternæ certiore atque adeo gaudio ac gustu quodam futuræ felicitatis aut singulari ardore complentur. For further passages, see *Winer.* Socinus thought assisting grace necessary, because the will of most men is weakened (not on account of Adam, but because of their own frequent transgressions); comp. the treatise mentioned above. He rejected the doctrine of predestination as destructive of all true religion; comp. Prælect. Theol. c. 6 ss. *Fock,* s. 662 ff.

(5) As early as the disputation of Leipzig, *Luther* compared man to a saw, which is a passive instrument in the hand of the carpenter; see *Möhler,* Symbolik, s. 106. Comp. Comment.

in Genes. c. 19: In spiritualibus et divinis rebus, quæ ad animæ salutem spectant, homo est instar statuæ salis, in quam uxor Patriarchæ Loth est conversa; imo est similis trunco et lapidi, statuæ vita carenti, quæ neque oculorum, oris, aut ullorum sensuum cordisque usum habet.—But it was especially in his treatise: De Servo Arbitrio, against Erasmus, that he expressed himself in the strongest terms; the many instances in which God exhorts man to keep His commandments appeared to him ironical, as if a father were to say to his child: "Come," while he knows that he cannot come (see *Galle*, Melanchthon, s. 270, Anm.; *Schenkel*, s. 81 ff.). In respect to predestination, see his letter to an anonymous person, Nr. 2622 in *De Wette* (*Seidemann*), vi. p. 427: Per Christum certi facti sumus, omnem credentem a Patre esse prædestinatum. Omnem enim prædestinavit, etiam vocavit per evangelium, *ut credat* et per fidem justificetur. . . . Nam verum est, Deum aliquos ex hominibus aliis rejectis ad æternam vitam elegisse et destinasse antequam jacerentur fundamenta mundi. Sed quia Deus in abscondito habitat et judicia ejus occulta sunt, non licet nobis tantam profunditatem assequi.—*Melanchthon* also advanced more rigid views in the first edition of his Loci, than in the subsequent ones. Comp. *Galle*, s. 247–326.—In accordance with these views, the Confession of Augsburg teaches, c. 18: De libero arbitrio docent, quod humana voluntas habeat aliquam libertatem ad efficiendam civilem justitiam et deligendas res rationi subjectas. Sed non habet vim sine Spiritu Sancto efficiendæ justitiæ Dei seu justitiæ spiritualis, quia animalis homo non percipit ea, quæ sunt Spiritus Dei (1 Cor. ii. 14), sed hæc fit in cordibus, cum per verbum Spir. S. concipitur.—Similar principles were set forth, after Calvin's example (*Schenkel*, ii. s. 106 ff.), in the symbols of the Reformed Churches. Conf. Helv. I. Art. 9, ii. 9: Proinde nullum est ad bonum homini arbitrium liberum, nondum renato, vires nullæ ad perficiendum bonum, etc. (for the other symbols, see *Winer*, s. 81 f.).—The change which took place in the opinions of *Melanchthon* gave rise to the *synergistic* controversy, see *Planck*, iv. s. 584 ff.; *Galle*, s. 336 ff. It is declared in the Refutation, which was published, Jena 1559, f. 36*b* (in *Planck*, s. 598): Fugiamus ac detestemur dogma eorum, qui

argute philosophantur, mentem et voluntatem hominis in conversione seu renovatione, esse *σύνεργον* seu causam concurrentem, cum et Deo debitum honorem eripiat, et suos defensores, ut Augustinus inquit, magis præcipitet ac temeraria confidentia labefactet, quam stabiliat. The same doctrine is propounded in the Formula Concordiæ, p. 662: Antequam homo per Spir. S. illuminatur, convertitur, regeneratur, et trahitur, ex sese et propriis naturalibus suis viribus in rebus spiritualibus et ad conversionem aut regenerationem suam nihil inchoare, operari, aut cooperari potest, nec plus quam lapis, truncus, aut limus. On the further dogmatic statements, see *Heppe*, s. 426 ff.

(6) The Formula Concordiæ, p. 617–618, endeavours to avoid this difficulty by drawing a distinction between prædestinatio et præscientia: Præscientia enim Dei nihil aliud est, quam quod Deus omnia noverit, antequam fiant. . . . Hæc præscientia Dei simul ad bonos et malos pertinet, sed interim non est causa mali, neque est causa peccati, quæ hominem ad scelus impellat. . . . Neque hæc Dei præscientia causa est, quod homines pereant; hoc enim sibi ipsis imputare debent. Sed præscientia Dei disponit malum, et metas illi constituit, quosque progredi et quamdiu durare debeat, idque eo dirigit, ut, licet per se malum sit, nihilominus electis Dei ad salutem cedat. . . . Prædestinatio vero seu æterna Dei electio tantum ad bonos et dilectos filios Dei pertinet, et hæc est causa ipsorum salutis. Etenim eorum salutem procurat et ea, quæ ad ipsam pertinent, disponit. Super hanc Dei prædestinationem salus nostra ita fundata est, ut inferorum portæ eam evertere nequeant. Hæc Dei prædestinatio non in arcano Dei consilio est scrutanda, sed in verbo Dei, in quo revelatur, quærenda est. — Such definitions were the consequences of the controversy with the Calvinists. It was occasioned by the controversy of two theologians of Strassburg, *John Marbach* and *Jerome Zanchius*, the former of whom belonged to the Lutheran, the latter to the Reformed Church; see *Planck*, vi. s. 809, and *C. Schmidt*, Peter Martyr Vermigli, s. 138.[1]

[1] The question took also a practical turn: Whether one ought to pray for the Pope or not? Marbach pronounced for the negative, Zanchi for the affirmative. We are forbidden to pray, he said, only for those who have committed the sin

111691

(7) Among the confessions of faith composed before the time of Calvin, the first Confession of Basel declares, Art. 1: "Therefore we confess that God, before the creation of the world, did elect all those to whom He will give the inheritance of eternal blessedness;" yet it is remarkable that this statement is not made in connection with the doctrine of original sin, but in the very first article, that respecting God. The same is the case with *Zwingli*, who pronounced decidedly in favour of predestination, Ad Carolum Imp. Fidei Ratio (Opp. iv. p. 6 s.): Constat autem et firma manet Dei electio: quos enim ille elegit ante mundi constitutionem, sic elegit, ut per filium suum sibi cooptaret: ut enim benignus et misericors, ita sanctus et justus est, etc. He unfolds his views in order in his work, De Providentia Dei (Opera, iv. p. 79 ss.). The sin of Adam, he says, was included in the predestination, but also redemption. Comp. p. 109 ss. Pag. 113: Est electio libera divinæ voluntatis de beandis constitutio. . . . Quemadmodum legislatoribus ac principibus integrum est constituere ex æqui bonique ratione, sic divinæ majestati integrum est ex natura sua, quæ ipsa bonitas est, constituere. Pag. 115: In destinandis ad salutem hominibus voluntas divina prima vis est: ancillantur autem sapientia, bonitas, justitia, et ceteræ dotes, quo fit, ut voluntati referatur, non sapientiæ . . . non justitiæ, non liberalitati divinæ. . . . Est igitur electio libera, sed non cæca, divinæ voluntatis, sed non solius quantumvis præcipuæ causæ, constitutio cum majestate et auctoritate, de beandis, non de damnandis. Pag. 140: Stat electio Dei firma et immota, etiamsi per filium suum præcepit, electos ad se transferre. . : . Firma manet electio, etiamsi electus in tam immania scelera prolabatur, qualia impii et repudiati designant. . . . Testes sunt David, Paulus, Magdalena, latro, alii.—Against the practical inference that the elect will not be harmed, sin as they may, *Zwingli* replies (ibid.): Qui sic loquuntur, testimonium dant, aut se electos non esse, aut fidem ac Dei cognitionem nondum habere. . . . Omnia cooperantur electis ad bonum; omnia quoque circum illos divina providentia fiunt, neque quicquam tam frivolum fit, quod in Dei ordinatione ac opere frivolum sit. Pag. 143: Hoc

against the Holy Ghost; but it cannot be affirmed *a priori* that a Pope, simply because he is Pope, has committed this sin.

omnino irrefragabile est, aut providentiam omnia curare, nuspiam cessare aut torpere, aut omnino nullam esse. For further particulars, see *Hahn* in the Studien und Kritiken, 1837, Heft 4, s. 765 ff.; and on the other side, *J. J. Herzog*, ib. 1838, H. 4, s. 778 ff. *Schweizer*, ii. s. 192 ff. *Schenkel*, ii. s. 386 ff. *Spörri*, s. 10 ff.—From a comparison instituted between Zwingli's doctrine of predestination and his general views on original sin and the salvation of the heathen (which differed from rigid Augustinianism), thus much is evident, that with Zwingli the doctrine of predestination was connected with his doctrine of *theology* more than with his *anthropology*, and proceeded from speculative rather than from ethical grounds. But this does not mean that he bordered the least upon pantheistic views.—*Calvin* brought the doctrine of predestination into closer connection with that of original sin, Instit. iii. c. 21–24. Thus he says, c. 23: Iterum quæro: Unde factum est, *ut tot gentes una cum liberis eorum infantibus æternæ morti involveret lapsus Adæ* absque remedio, nisi quia Deo ita visum est? Hic obmutescere oportet tam dicaces alioqui linguas. Decretum quidem *horribile* fateor; inficiari tamen nemo poterit, quin præsciverit Deus, quem exitum esset habiturus homo, antequam ipsum conderet, et ideo præsciverit, quia decreto suo sic ordinarat. Comp. the other passages. And in the second Confess. Helvet. the articles on the fall of man (8), and on the freedom of the will (9), precede, in the order of subjects, that on predestination (10). Comp. also Conf. Gall., Art. 12; Belg., Art. 16. Canon. Dordr. i. 1, etc., quoted by *Winer*; see note 11.

(8) Inst. iii. c. 23, § 7, *Calvin* terms the exclusion of the fall of the first man from the divine predestination a "*frigidum commentum.*" Comp. § 4: Quum ergo in sua corruptione pereunt (homines), nihil aliud quam pœnas luunt ejusdem calamitatis, *in quam ipsius prædestinatione lapsus est Adam* ac posteros suos præcipites secum traxit. It is on this particular point that *Calvin* (and his disciple *Beza*[1]) went farther than Augustine, who did not include the fall of Adam in the divine predestination. Calvin infers the doctrine of

[1] On the question, how far Luther was inclined to adopt such a notion, see *Baur* in his work against *Möhler*, s. 38.

predestination *both* from ethico-anthropological *and* from theologico-speculative premisses; in his opinion it has a practical as well as a theoretical aspect. The name *Supralapsarians*, however, does not occur before the Synod of Dort. It was especially the *Gomarists* who were favourable to the supralapsarian scheme.[1] "*Though the Synod of Dort hesitated to declare in favour of Supralapsarianism, yet this was, at any rate, the inmost sense of orthodoxy*," *Schweizer*, ii. p. 124.

(9) This was the case, *e.g.*, with the preachers of Delft. Comp. *Schröckh*, Kg. n. der Reform. v. s. 224. The Synod of Dort also was satisfied with the infralapsarian scheme; at least its decrees made no express mention of Supralapsarianism. And the Form. Cons., Art. 5, only says that Adam's fall was permitted.

(10) Concerning the necessary connection between the universality of grace and conditional election on the one hand, and between particularism (limited redemption) and unconditional election on the other, see *Planck*, l.c. Thus we find in the Formula Concordiæ, p. 618: Christus vero omnes peccatores ad se vocat et promittit illis levationem, et serio vult, ut omnes homines ad se veniant et sibi consuli et subveniri sinant. P. 619: Quod vero scriptum est, multos quidem vocatos, paucos vero electos esse, non ita accipiendum est, quasi Deus nolit, ut omnes salventur, sed damnationis impiorum causa est, quod verbum Dei aut prorsus non audiant, sed contumaciter contemnant, aures obdurent et cor indurent et hoc modo Spiritui Sancto viam ordinariam præcludant, ut opus suum in his efficere nequeat, aut certe quod verbum

[1] *Episcopius*, Instit. v. 5, thus defines the difference between the two schemes: Duplex est eorum sententia, qui absolutam hujusmodi prædestinationis gratiam asserunt. Una est eorum, qui statuunt, decretum prædestinationis absolute a Deo ab æterno factum esse, ante omnem hominis aut condendi aut conditi aut lapsi (nedum resipiscentis et credentis) considerationem vel prævisionem. Hi *Supralapsarii* vocantur. Altera est eorum, qui prædestinationis istius objectum statuunt, homines definite præscitos, creatos, ac lapsos. *Definite*, inquam, præscitos, etc., ut a prima sententia distinguatur, quæ statuit, objectum prædestinationis homines indefinite præscitos, seu (ut D. Gomarus loquitur) creabiles, labiles, reparabiles, salvabiles, hoc est, qui creari ac prædestinari poterant. Et hi *Sublapsarii* (Infralapsarii) vocantur. . . . Discrepat posterior sententia a priore in eo tantum, quod prior prædestinationem præordinet lapsui, posterior eam lapsui subordinet. Illa præordinat eam lapsui, ne Deum insipientem faciat: hæc subordinat, ne Deum injustum faciat, *i.e.* lapsus auctorem. Comp. *Limborch*, Theol. Christ. iv. 2.

auditum flocci pendant atque abjiciant. Quod igitur pereunt, neque Deus, neque ipsius electio, sed malitia eorum in culpa est.—The same doctrine was taught by the Remonstrants, Art. 2: Jesum Christum, mundi servatorem, pro omnibus et singulis mortuum esse, atque ita quidem, ut omnibus per mortem Christi reconciliationem et peccatorum remissionem impetraverit, ea tamen conditione, ut nemo illa remissione peccatorum re ipsa fruatur præter hominem fidelem, et hoc quoque secundum evangelium. For other passages, see *Winer*, s. 92.

(11) Thus the first Confession of Basel (comp. note 7) does not exclude the possibility that God may have elected all men, or at least all who believe. The authors of the Confess. Helvetica also were cautious in their expressions, c. 10: Deus ab æterno prædestinavit vel elegit libere et mera sua gratia, nullo hominis respectu, sanctos, quos vult salvos facere in Christo. . . . Et quamvis Deus norit, qui sint sui, et alicubi mentio fiat paucitatis electorum, *bene sperandum est tamen de omnibus, neque temere reprobis quisquam est adnumerandus.* Comp. too, Conf. Angl., Art. 17. Scot., Art. 8. In the Catech. Heidelb. too, Qu. 20, Predestination is made to depend on *faith.* The Calvinists of later times were not agreed among themselves whether Qu. 37 implies the universality of the merits of Christ or not; see *Beckhaus*, l.c. s. 70 f. [Qu. 37: "What dost thou understand by the words *He suffered?*" *Answer:* "That He, all the time that He lived on earth, but especially at the end of His life, sustained in body and soul the wrath of God *against the sins of all mankind.*"] The Confess. Marchica maintains naively, Art. 14 (after a previous affirmation), "that God is not a cause of the ruin of man, that He takes no pleasure in the death of the wicked, that He neither introduced sin into the world, nor impels men to sin,—not that *He will not have all men saved,* for the very contrary is asserted in Scripture,—but that the origin of sin and perdition is to be found in Satan and the wicked, whom God, on account of their unbelief and disobedience, cast into condemnation. Item, *that we ought not to despair of the salvation of any one so long as the proper means for obtaining salvation are used,* for no man knows when God will effectually call His people, nor who may yet believe or not, because God is not bound to any time, and orders all things according to His

good pleasure. Therefore His Electoral Grace rejects all and every partly blasphemous, partly dangerous, opinions and discourses, such as that we must ascend into heaven by means of our reason, and there examine a special register, or the secret chancery or council-chamber of God, as to the question who is ordained to eternal life or not, though God has sealed up the book of life so that no creature can look into it." Nevertheless the same Confession expressly condemns as a Pelagian error the notion that God elected the saints propter fidem provisam.—The doctrine of particular redemption is set forth not only in the Confess. Gall., Art. 12; Belg., Art. 6 (quoted by *Winer*, s. 88), but definitely in the decrees of the Synod of Dort (quoted by *Winer*, s. 89), and the Form. Cons., Art. 4: Deus ante jacta mundi fundamenta in Christo fecit propositum seculorum (Eph. iii. 11), in quo ex mero voluntatis suæ beneplacito sine ulla meriti, operum, vel fidei prævisione ad laudem gloriosæ gratiæ suæ elegit *certum ac definitum* in eadem corruptionis massa et communi sanguine jacentium adeoque peccato corruptorum *numerum*, in tempore per Christum sponsorem et mediatorem unicum ad salutem perducendum, etc. [It has been attempted to show that the Westminster Confession is not inconsistent in its statements with the theory of man's free-will. It is difficult, however, to see how it varies from the other Calvinistic Confessions. We read in chap. iii.: God from all eternity did, by the most wise and holy counsel of His own will, *freely and unchangeably ordain whatsoever comes to pass;* yet so as thereby neither is God the author of sin, nor is violence offered to the will of the creature, nor is the liberty or contingence of second causes taken away, but rather established (!). 2. Although God knows whatever may or can come to pass, upon all supposed conditions, *yet hath He not decreed anything because He foresaw it as future*, or that which would come to pass, upon such conditions.]

With such views were [inseparably] connected the questions respecting the doctrine of irresistible and indefectible grace. According to the teaching of the Reformed, grace works irresistibly, nor can a man lose it when once he has obtained it. *Calvin*, Instit. iii. 2, 12. Canon. Dord. v. 3. The Lutherans take the opposite view, Confess. Aug. 12 (p. 13, against the Anabaptists). Form. Concord. p. 705: [Et quidem imprimis falsa et Epicurea illa opinio graviter redarguenda atque rejicienda est, quod quidam

fingunt, fidem et acceptam justitiam atque salutem non posse ullis peccatis aut sceleribus . . . amitti]. *Winer*, s. 108 (3d ed.). Comp. also the Arminian and Socinian creeds, quoted by *Winer*, s. 112. So, too, the doctrine of the certainty of salvation (certitudo salutis) made a part of the theology of the Reformed Church; see *Calvin*, Institutes, iii. c. 24, § 4. As regards the virtues and felicity of the heathen, the adherents of the Augustinian system adopted the views of its founder. This gave more significance to *Zwingli's* different view, advanced in his Christ. Fidei brevis et clara Expositio, § 10.

§ 250.

Controversies respecting Predestination within the various Confessions.

As early as the lifetime of Calvin himself, *Sebastian Castellio* and *Jerome Bolsec*, both of Geneva, raised their voices against Calvin's doctrine, but without producing any impression (1). The more moderate views of Arminius and his followers always had secret adherents in the Reformed Church. *Moses Amyraldus*, a disciple of Cameron, and professor of theology in the academy of Saumur, openly pronounced in favour of what is called Universalismus hypotheticus (2), a synthesis of universalism and particularism, and was followed by other French theologians (3). *Claude Pajon*, his disciple, represented the gracious influence of the Holy Spirit as so intimately connected with the operations of the word, that he denied an immediate influence of the Spirit upon the heart; but yet he proposed to have no controversy with the Calvinistic doctrine of predestination (4). *Samuel Huber*, who had seceded from the Reformed to the Lutheran Church, extended the universality of salvation farther than the Lutheran theologians allowed, and was therefore persecuted by both parties (5). —In the Roman Catholic Church the advocates of the strict system of Augustine endeavoured, on different occasions, to re-establish its ancient authority. The controversies carried on in the University of Louvain (6), and the attempt of *Louis Molina* to reconcile the doctrine of predestination with that concerning the freedom of the will (7), gave rise to the papal Congrega-

tiones de Auxiliis (gratiæ divinæ), which, however, did not lead to any important result (8), until at last *Jansenism* established a permanent opposition to the Pelagian tendency of the Roman Church. The Jansenists also adopted the views of their master concerning predestination (9).

(1) Shortly after *Castellio* had removed from Geneva to Basel (1544), he published an exposition of the ninth chapter of Paul's Epistle to the Romans, in which he violently attacked the Calvinistic doctrine. In an anonymous pamphlet, published at Paris under the title, "Auszüge aus den lateinischen und französischen Schriften Calvins," the doctrine of election by grace was combated "*with the weapons of the keenest satire and acutest dialectics in a manner worthy of Voltaire.*" *Henry*, Leben Calvins, i. s. 389. After his death were published: *Sebast. Castellionis* Dialogi IV. de predestinatione, de electione, de libero arbitrio, de fide. Aresdorfi (Basil.) 1578.[1] On the controversial writings of *Bolsec*, see *Bretschneider* in Ref.-Almanach 1821, s. 117. *Henry*, iii. s. 48 ff.; *Schenkel*, ii. s. 174 f. *Stähelin*, ii. s. 273 ff.

(2) On his history (he died 1664), see *Bayle*, Dictionnaire, s.v. Amyraut; *Jablonski*, Institutt. Hist. Christ. recent. p. 313. *Schröckh*, Kg. nach der Ref. viii. s. 660 ff. See also above. It was especially against the assertions of Amyraut, as well as of *Louis Cappellus* and *Josua de la Place*, that the rigid doctrine of the Formula Consensus was directed (comp. § 249, note 11). The views of *Amyraut* are developed in his Traité de la Prédestination, Saumur 1634. Comp. *e.g.* p. 89: Si vous considerés le soin que Dieu a eu de procurer le salut au genre humain par l'envoy de son fils au monde, et les choses qu'il y a faites et souffertes à ceste fin, la grace est *universelle* et présentée à tous les hommes. Mais si vous regardés *à la condition* qu'il y a nécessairement apposée, de croire en sons fils, vous trouverés qu'encore que ce soin de donner aux hommes un Rédempteur procède d'une merveilleuse charité envers le genre humain, néantmoins ceste charité ne passe pas ceste mesure, de donner le salut aux hommes, pourveu qu'ils ne le refusent pas: s'ils le refusent, il leur en oste l'espérance, et

[1] With a Preface by Felix Turpio Urbevetanus (*Faustus Socinus*); see Athen. Raur. p. 360.

eux par leur incrédulité aggravent leur condamnation. Comp. Specimen Animadversionum in Exercitationes de gratia universali, Salmur. 1684, 4to.—On the further progress of this controversy, see *Walch*, Biblioth. Theol. selecta, ii. p. 1023 ss. On *Amyraut* in particular, see *Schweizer*, Moses Amyraldus, Versuch einer Synthese des Universalismus und des Particularismus (in Zellers Jahrbb. 1852, 1, 2—chiefly against Ebrard's representation): "*Amyraldism has been designated hypothetical universalism. But this is liable to be misunderstood, and to favour a perverted representation of the system, as if it broke through the bounds of Calvinistic particularism, and, as Ebrard thinks, retained this characteristic only in appearance; while the fact is, that Amyraut was thoroughly in earnest, and even made the doctrine more sharp, whenever possible.*" Yet still there is in Amyraldism an important mitigation of the dogma in this point of view, that "*he appended an ideal universalism to the particularizing world-plan.*"

(3) *Tessard, Daillé, Blondel, Claude, Du Bose, Le Faucheur, Mestrezat, Tronchin.*—In opposition was *Du Moulin* (Molinæus) of Sédan, and especially *Friedr. Spanheim* (Spanhemius) in his Exercitationes de Gratia Universali, Lugd. Batav. 1646, to which *Amyraut* replied in his Exercitatio de Gratia Universali, Salm. 1647. See *Schweizer*, s. 61.

(4) The views of *Pajon* were especially contested from the Reformed side by *Claude* and *Jurieu:* Traité de la Nature et de la Grace, ou du Concours général de la Providence, et du Concours particulier de la Grace efficace, contre les nouvelles hypothèses de Mr. P.[ajon] et de ses disciples, Utrecht 1687; also by *Leydecker* and *Spanheim;* from the Lutheran side by *Val. Ernest Löscher* (Exercitatio Theol. de Claudii Pajonii ejusque Sectatoribus quos Pajonistas vocant Doctrina et Fatis, Lips. 1692).—On the relation between his individual opinion and the general dogmatic system of the Reformed Church, and on its significance for the Reformed Theology, see *Al. Schweizer* in the treatise referred to, § 225, note 3 [and in *Herzog's* Realencyklop.].

(5) *Huber* was a native of Burgdorf, in the Canton Bern, in Switzerland, but was compelled to leave his country on account of his opinions. After he had joined the Lutheran Church, he became first a pastor in the neighbourhood of Tübingen, and

afterwards a professor in the University of Wittenberg. His assertion, that God from eternity elected *all men* to salvation (without respect to their future faith), gave offence to the Lutherans. He was opposed by *Polycarp Lyser* and *Ægidius Hunnius* (1593), whom he in his turn charged with Calvinism. For the particulars of the controversy, and the explanations of *Huber*, see *Schröckh*, iv. s. 661, and *Andr. Schmidii* Dissert. de Sam. Huberi Vita, Fatis, et Doctrina, Helmst. 1708, 4to. *Jul. Wiggers*, Beiträge zur Lebensgesch. Sam. Hubers, in Illgens Zeitschrift, 1844. *Trechsel* in the Berner Taschenbuch, 1854. *Schweizer*, Centraldogmen. i. s. 501 ff.

(6) The old controversy between the Thomists and Scotists (Dominicans and Franciscans) was revived in the age of the Reformation. While the Council of Trent was still assembled, the controversy broke out between *Michael Bajus* (De Bay, born 1513, died 1585) and his colleagues, who were followers of Scotus. Pope Pius V. issued a bull (A.D. 1567), in which he condemned seventy-six propositions of Bajus (several of which were taken verbally from Augustine); but this was done only in a certain sense. Gregory XIII. confirmed this sentence A.D. 1579. But when the Jesuits *Leonard Less* and *John Hamel* propounded the Pelagian System too boldly, the professors in the University of Louvain raised their voices against thirty-four propositions taken from their lectures, and publicly condemned them. For further details, see the works on Church history. *Baji* Opp., Col. 1696, 4to.

(7) *Molina* was also a Jesuit, born 1540, and died 1600 (as a professor of theology in the University of Evora, in Portugal). *He wrote:* Liberi arbitrii cum gratiæ donis, divina præscientia, providentia, prædestinatione, et reprobatione concordia. He endeavoured to bring about this reconciliation by distinguishing between præscientia and prædeterminatio; he called the former scientia media.

(8) They were drawn up A.D. 1597 by order of Pope Clement VIII., and issued 1607 by Pope Paul V. The Pope imposed (1611) silence upon both parties.—Comp. *Aug. Le Blanc* (Serry), Historia Congreg. de Auxiliis Gratiæ, Antw. 1790 (1709 ?), fol.

(9) See the General History of Doctrines. Pope Urban VIII. condemned the "Augustinus" of Jansen in the bull In Emi-

nenti (Bullar. M., tom. v.), and Pope Innocent x. condemned (1653) five propositions in particular. For further details, see the works on Church history. On the principles of the Jansenists, see *Reuchlin*, Port-Royal. Compare § 228.

[The English Articles have been represented as being Calvinistic, but the subsequent attempt to introduce the Lambeth Articles is a proof that they did not fully satisfy the Calvinistic school. The 17th, Of Predestination and Election: "Predestination to life is the everlasting purpose of God, whereby (before the foundations of the world were laid) He hath constantly decreed by His counsel secret to us, to deliver from curse and damnation those whom He hath chosen in Christ out of mankind, and to bring them by Christ to everlasting salvation, as vessels made to honour. Wherefore they which be endued with so excellent a benefit of God be called according to God's purpose by His Spirit working in due season: they through grace obey the calling: they be justified freely: they be made sons of God by adoption: they be made like the image of His only-begotten Son Jesus Christ; they walk religiously in good works; and at length, by God's mercy, they attain to everlasting felicity."—Then follow cautions about the use of the doctrine—"for curious and carnal persons, lacking the Spirit of Christ, to have continually before their eyes the sentence of Predestination, is a most dangerous downfall," etc.]

§ 251.

Justification and Sanctification. Faith and Works.

Möhler, Symbolik, s. 134 ff. *Baur*, s. 215 ff. (1st ed.), s. 330 (2d ed.). *Hase*, Polemik, s. 242 ff.

While Roman Catholics and Protestants agreed in ascribing to God the justification of the sinner, they differed in this, that the former combined the act of justification with that of sanctification, so as to represent both as the one act of *making just* (justificatio) (1), while the Protestants separated the one from the other, asserting that the justification of the sinner before God (which is described as a forensic act on the part

of God) is antecedent to his sanctification, which is physical and therapeutical (2). Both Roman Catholics and Protestants ascribe to *faith* a justifying power in the case of the sinner; but there was this great difference between them, that the former maintained that, *along with* faith, good works are a necessary condition of salvation, and ascribed to them a certain degree of meritoriousness (3), while the latter adhered rigidly to the proposition "*sola fides justificat*" (4). Some opposing sects (5), however, which had their origin in Protestantism, formed here again an exception. While Arminians and Socinians agreed with other Protestants in restricting justification in the first instance to the act of granting pardon (6), the Mennonites and Quakers regarded it as a therapeutic act (7). On the relation between faith and works, the Arminians and Socinians, as well as the Mennonites, adopted views more closely allied to those of the Roman Catholics, but with this important difference (8), that they denied the meritoriousness of works (9), though holding them to be necessary. [Many theologians of the Anglican Church occupied an intermediate position (10).]

(1) Conc. Trid., Sess. vi. cap. 7: Justificatio non est sola peccatorum remissio, sed et sanctificatio et renovatio interioris hominis per voluntariam susceptionem gratiæ et donorum, unde homo ex injusto fit justus et ex inimico amicus, ut sit hæres secundum spem vitæ æternæ, etc. Comp. Can. 11, and *Bellarmine*, De Justif. ii. 2: . . . Sicut aër, cum illustratur a sole per idem lumen, quod recipit, desinit esse tenebrosus et incipit esse lucidus, sic etiam homo per eandem justitiam sibi a sole justitiæ donatam atque infusam desinit esse injustus, delente videlicet lumine gratiæ tenebras peccatorum, etc.

(2) Apol. August. Conf. p. 125: Justificare hoc loco (Rom. v. 1), forensi consuetudine significat reum absolvere et pronuntiare justum, sed propter alienam justitiam, videlicet Christi, quæ aliena justitia communicatur nobis per fidem. Comp. p. 73, p. 109. Form. Conc. p. 685. Helv. II. c. 15: Justificare significat Apostolo in disputatione de justificatione: peccata remittere, a culpa et pœna absolvere, in gratiam recipere

et justum pronuntiare.—"*According to Roman Catholic principles, Christ, by the act of justification, is livingly impressed upon the believer, so that the latter becomes a living reflection of the prototype; according to the Protestant doctrine, He casts only His shadow upon the believer, which so shelters him that God does not see his sinfulness.*" *Möhler*, Symbolik, s. 134. On the other side, see *Baur*, s. 229 ff., and the passage quoted by Möhler himself, s. 136, from *Calvin's* Antidot. in Conc. Trid. p. 702: Neque tamen negandum est, quin perpetuo *conjunctæ sint ac cohæreant* duæ istæ res sanctificatio et justificatio. Protestants do not deny that justification and sanctification are connected, but they do deny that they are one and the same thing; and when the Formula Conc. (Solida Declar. iii. p. 695) says: Totam justitiam nostram *extra nos* quærendam, it explains this immediately after by adding: extra omnium hominum merita, opera, etc.

(3) Conc. Trid., Sess. vi. c. 6, Can. 8: Per fidem ideo justificari dicimur, quia fides est humanæ salutis *initium, fundamentum et radix* omnis justificationis.—On the other hand, c. 9: Si quis dixerit, *sola* fide impium justificari, ita ut intelligat nihil aliud requiri, quod ad justificationis gratiam consequendam cooperetur . . . anathema sit. Comp. c. 12. This is allied with the moral and external (historical) idea of faith. Cat. Rom. I. i. 1: Nos de ea fide loquimur, cujus vi omnino assentimur iis, quæ tradita sunt divinitus. *Faith* taken in this sense (as submission to the authority of the Church) may be said to be meritorious. The meritoriousness of works consists in this, that the justitia is *increased* by the performance of good works. Comp. Concil. Trident., Sess. vi. (quoted by *Winer*, s. 104); Catech. Rom. ii. 5, 71. *Bellarmine*, De Justific. v. 1, iv. 7. Nevertheless (according to *Bellarmine*), the merits of men will *not* throw the merits of Christ into the shade; they are rather themselves the fruit of the merits of Christ, and serve to manifest His glory among men. *Bellarmine*, v. 5 (quoted by *Winer*, s. 105).

(4) Conf. Aug., Art. 4: Docent, quod homines non possunt justificari coram Deo propriis viribus, meritis, aut operibus, sed gratis justificentur propter Christum per fidem, cum credunt se in gratiam recipi, et peccata remitti propter Christum, qui sua morte pro nostris peccatis satisfecit. Hanc fidem imputat

Deus pro justitia coram ipso.—But Protestants did not understand by faith mere *historical* faith (as did Roman Catholics [1]), see Art. 20 (p. 18): Admonentur etiam homines, quod hic nomen fidei non significet tantum historiæ notitiam, qualis est in impiis et diabolo, sed significet fidem, quæ credit non tantum historiam, sed etiam *effectum historiæ*, videlicet hunc articulum, remissionem peccatorum, quod videlicet per Christum habeamus gratiam, justitiam, et remissionem peccatorum. Comp. Apol. p. 68.—With respect to good works, and the relation in which they stand to faith, *Luther* at first set a high value upon the *genuine* works of mercy, distinguishing these from the dead works of the law and of ceremonies; but he also denied the meritoriousness of the best works, and regarded them with suspicion, whenever they did not proceed from faith; comp. *Schenkel*, ii. s. 193 ff.—The Confess. August. says, Art. 20, p. 16: Falso accusantur nostri, quod bona opera prohibeant. . . . Docent nostri, quod necesse sit bona opera facere, non ut confidamus per ea gratiam mereri, sed propter voluntatem Dei.—Apol. p. 81: Nos quoque dicimus, quod dilectio fidem sequi debeat. Neque tamen ideo sentiendum est, quod fiducia hujus dilectionis aut propter hanc dilectionem accipiamus remissionem peccatorum et reconciliationem. Ibid. p. 85: Falso calumniantur nos adversarii, quod nostri non doceant bona opera, cum ea non solum requirant, sed etiam ostendant, quomodo fieri possint, etc. Comp. *Winer*, s. 99 and 105, where other passages are quoted from the Lutheran symbols. —The creeds of the Reformed Church express themselves in similar terms. Thus the Confession of Basel, Art. 9, *On Faith and Works:* We acknowledge the forgiveness of sins by faith in Jesus Christ the crucified; though this faith continually exercises, and manifests itself, and is preserved, by works of

[1] The contending parties were well acquainted with the different meanings attached to the term "faith." See *Bellarmine*, De Justific. § 4. They were not engaged in any mere logomachy. Only this is to be lamented, that the Protestants (even Luther) did not hold fast to the internal and dynamic idea of faith, but frequently confounded it (like the Catholics) with the fides historica. This gave rise to a "righteousness by faith" worse even than "righteousness by works," since it cost no effort, and gave occasion to pride and harshness towards those who held different views; see *Schenkel*, ii. s. 200 ff. *Zwingli*, on the other hand, urged the *moral* nature of faith, ibid. s. 299. *Melanchthon* and *Calvin* tried to harmonize the dogmatic and ethical aspects of the idea, ibid. s. 322 ff.

love, we do not ascribe righteousness and satisfaction for our sins to works as the fruit of faith, but solely to true confidence and faith in the blood of the Lamb of God, which was shed for the remission of our sins; for we freely confess that all things are given to us in Christ. Therefore believers are not to perform good works to make satisfaction for their sins, but only in order to manifest their gratitude for the great mercy which the Lord God has shown to us in Christ.—Compare also the arrangement of the Catechism of Heidelberg, where the whole system of ethics is included in the article concerning Gratitude. Conf. Helv. II. c. 15: Quoniam vero nos justificationem hanc recepimus non per ulla opera, sed per fidem in Dei misericordiam et Christum. Ideo docemus et credimus cum Apostolo, hominem peccatorem justificari sola fide in Christum non lege aut ullis operibus. . . . Loquimur in hac causa non de ficta fide, de inani aut otiosa aut mortua, sed de fide viva vivificanteque, quæ propter Christum, qui vita est et vivificat, viva est et dicitur, ac se vivam esse vivis declarat operibus." The following definition is given in ch. 16: Fides humana non est opinio ac humana persuasio, sed firmissima fiducia et evidens ac constans animi assensus, denique rectissima comprehensio veritatis Dei . . . atque adeo Dei ipsius, summi boni, et præcipue promissionis divinæ et Christi, qui omnium promissionum est colophon.—Heidelberg Catech., Qu. 21: What is true faith? *Ans.* It is not only a certain knowledge whereby I hold for truth all that God has revealed to us in His word, but also a heartfelt confidence, which the Holy Ghost works by the gospel within me, that not only to others, but to me also, remission of sins, everlasting righteousness and blessedness are freely given by God, of pure grace, only for the sake of Christ's merits.

(5) For example, *Thomas Münzer, David Joris, Seb. Frank, Thamer, Schwenkfeld,* and others. See *Schenkel,* ii. s. 251. *Hagen,* ii. s. 374 ff.

(6) Confess. Remonstrant. 18. 3, and Apol. Conf. Rem. p. 112*a* (quoted by *Winer,* s. 97): Justificatio est actio Dei, quam Deus pure pute in sua ipsius mente efficit, quia nihil aliud est, quam volitio aut decretum, quo peccata remittere et justitiam imputare aliquando vult iis, qui credunt, *i.e.* quo vult pœnas peccatis eorum promeritas iis non infligere eosque tam-

quam justos tractare et præmio afficere.—The *Socinians* also regarded justification as a forensic act. Catech. Racov., Qu. 453 (ibid.): Justificatio est, cum nos Deus pro justis habet, quod ea ratione facit, cum nobis et peccata remittit et nos vita æterna donat. Comp. *Socinus*, De Justif. (Opp. ii. p. 603): *Duplici* autem ratione amovetur peccatum: vel quia non imputatur ac perinde habetur ac si nunquam fuisset, vel quia peccatum ipsum revera aufertur, nec amplius peccatur. . . . What he says further on: *Utraque* hæc amovendi peccati ratio in justificatione coram Deo nostra conspicitur, might lead us to think that he identified sanctification and justification, but in the sequel he distinctly separates them: Ut autem cavendum est, ne, ut hodie plerique faciunt, vitæ sanctitatem atque innocentiam effectum justificationis nostræ coram Deo esse dicamus, sic diligenter cavere debemus, ne ipsam sanctitatem atque innocentiam justificationem nostram coram Deo esse credamus, neve illam nostræ coram Deo justificationis causam efficientem aut impulsivam esse affirmemus, sed tantummodo causam, sine qua eam justificationem non contingere decrevit Deus. The difference between justificatio and obedientia is so defined, that by the former we are to understand the remissio peccatorum, and by obedientia a mere condition, under which justification takes place.

(7) *Ris*, Conf., Art. 21: Per vivam fidem acquirimus veram justitiam i. e. condonationem seu remissionem omnium tam præteritorum quam præsentium peccatorum, ut et veram justitiam, quæ per Jesum co-operante Spir. Sancto abundanter in nos effunditur vel infunditur, adeo ut ex malis . . . fiamus boni atque ita ex injustis revera justi.—*Barclay* (Apol. 7, 3, p. 128) does not comprise under justification good works as such, not even when viewed as the effects of the Holy Spirit in us, but the *formatio Christi in nobis*, the new birth, which at the same time comprehends sanctification; for it is *realis interna animæ renovatio*. . . . Qui Christum in ipsis formatum habent, integrum eum et indivisum possident.

(8) *Limborch*, Theol. Christ. vi. 4, 22: . . . Sine operibus fides mortua et ad justificationem inefficax est, 4, 31. Comp. Conf. Remonstr. xi. 1 s., and Apol. Confess. p. 113 (in *Winer*, s. 102). According to *Socinus* (De Justif. in the Biblioth. Fratr. Pol. tom. ii. p. 601 s.), there is faith in obedience to

the divine commandments. "*When they advance anything else concerning justifying faith . . . they borrow it from the Catholic schools*" (?), *Möhler*, s. 634. For the views of the Mennonites on justification, see *Ris*, Confess., Art. 20: Fides . . . debet comitata esse amore Dei et firma confidentia in unum Deum.

(9) *Schyn*, Plen. Deduct. p. 232 (in *Winer*, s. 107): Non credimus bona opera nos salvare, sed agnoscimus bona opera pro debita obedientia et fructibus fidei. *Socinus* also asserted that good works, though necessary, are not meritorious (non sunt meritoria), De Justif. p. 603.

(10) [The Homily on Justification in the English Book of Homilies, 1547, was written by *Cranmer*, and has been thought to admit of different interpretations. Thus on one side stands Bp. *George Bull*, Harmonia Apostolica, two dissertations on the doctrine of James on Justification, and his agreement with Paul (Works, vol. iii.); and on the other, *John Davenant*, Bp. of Salisbury, Treatise on Justification, 1631, new ed. 1844, defends the Reformed doctrine. See also Bp. *William Forbes* (of Edinburgh, born 1585, died 1634), Considerationes Modestæ (against Bellarmine on Justification), Lond. 1658 (posthumous), reprinted, Lib. Angl. Cath. Theol. i. 1850. The Article XI. (of the XXXIX. Articles) reads: We are accounted righteous before God, only for the merit of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ by Faith, and not for our own works or deservings: Wherefore, that we are justified by Faith only is a most wholesome Doctrine, and very full of comfort, as more largely is expressed in the Homily of Justification. Art. XII. represents good works only as the "fruits of faith."]

§ 252.

Fluctuations within the various Confessions.

Differences of opinion, however, obtained within the Protestant communions. Thus *Andreas Osiander* represented justification and sanctification as forming only one act (1); and as regards the relation in which good works stand to faith,

the views of *Nicolas Amsdorf* were diametrically opposed to those of *Georg Major*. The latter asserted that good works contributed to salvation, while the former maintained that they are productive rather of evil than of good (2). *Calixtus*, somewhat later, emphasized the ethical element, and although he retained the formula *sola* fides, he opposed the fides *solitaria* (3). Both the Lutheran and Calvinistic mystics attached (like the Quakers) great importance to sanctification, and were strongly opposed to that theology which represents justification as an external, legal transaction (4).

(1) On *Osiander's* doctrine in its earliest form (after 1524), see *Heberle* in the Studien u. Kritiken, 1844, 2. It is further developed in the two disputations, which he held A.D. 1549 and 1550, in his treatise De unico Mediatore, 1551, and in various sermons. He maintained that what was called justification by orthodox theologians, should be more properly designated *redemption*. (Illustrated by the case of a Moor ransomed from slavery.) In his opinion, the signification of δικαιοῦν is to "make just;" it is only by metonymy that it can mean "to pronounce a person just." Comp. *Planck*, iv. s. 249 ff. *Tholuck's* Anzeiger, 1833, Nr. 54 f. *Schenkel*, ii. s. 355 ff. He was opposed by *Francis Staphylus*, *Mörlin*, and others.—From the Reformed side, too, *Calvin* is decidedly opposed to the views of Osiander, which he calls a calumnia. Comp. Inst. iii. c. 11, § 10 ss., and c. 13, § 5: Quicumque garriunt, nos fide justificari, quia regeniti spiritualiter vivendo justi sumus, nunquam gustarunt gratiæ dulcedinem, ut Deum sibi propitium fore confiderent. Comp. *R. F. Grau*, De Andreæ Osiandri doctrina Commentatio, Marburg 1860. *Ritschl*, Die Rechtfertigungslehre des Andr. Osiander (Jahrb. f. deutsche Theol. x. s. 795 ff.), and *Pelt* in *Herzog*, x. s. 720–724.

(2) Comp. *Amsdorf's* treatise: "Dass die Propositio, gute Werke sind schädlich zur Seligkeit, eine rechte sei," reprinted in *S. Baumgarten*, Geschichte der Religionsparteien, s. 1172–1178. Amsdorf speaks, in the first instance, of those works by which men hope to deserve salvation; but even those works which are the fruit of faith are imperfect on account of sin, and would condemn us before the judgment-seat of Christ, if

God did not graciously accept them for the sake of faith in Christ. In his opinion, there was no medium between that which is *necessary* to salvation, and that which *does harm*. "Though the dialectical proof of this inference or consequence come short of being complete, which, however, it does not, it can satisfactorily be established on theological grounds." But it is especially "on account of monks and hypocrites that it is necessary to adhere to this proposition, though it may sound offensive to reason and in philosophia." Amsdorf admits that works may be the "*manifestations and evidences of faith*," "for as long as faith exists, good works also follow, and when we commit sin, we do not *lose* salvation, because *we have previously lost it by unbelief*." Comp. *Planck*, iv. s. 69 ff.

(3) See Disputatio Theologica de gratuita Justificatione, præside J. Calixto exponit *G. Titius*, Helmst. 1650. Against this the Consensus Repetitus, Punct. 42–57 (in *Henke*, p. 32 ss.). *Gass*, s. 74 ff.

(4) *Schwenkfeld* had already maintained that the tendency of Luther's doctrine was to seduce common people into carnal liberty and error. He admitted that the doctrine (concerning faith and works) was true in a certain sense, and under certain limitations, but he thought that it might easily be perverted so as to lead to belief in the mere letter of Scripture, and to moral indifference. Comp. *Planck*, v. 1, s. 83 ff. *Schenkel*, l.c. (§ 251, note 5). Faith, according to Schwenkfeld, is essentially dynamic, "a gracious gift of the divine essence, a drop from the heavenly fountain, a glittering of the eternal sun, a spark of the eternal fire, which is God, and in short, a *communion* and *participation* of the divine nature and essence" (ὑπόστασις, Heb. xi. 1); see his work, "Vom Worte Gottes," s. 110*b*, and *Erbkam*, Prot. Secten, s. 431 ff. *J. Böhm* (Von der Menschwerdung Christi, Thl. ii. c. 7, § 15, quoted by *Umbreit*, s. 51) says: "The hypocritical Babylon now teaches: Our works deserve nothing, Christ has redeemed us from death and hell, we must only *believe* it, in order to be saved. Dost thou not know, Babylon, that the servant who, knowing his master's will, does not fulfil it, will be beaten with many stripes? Knowledge without action is like a fire which glimmers, but cannot burn, because the fuel is moist. If thou wilt have thy fire of faith burn, thou must blow upon it, and

free it from the moisture of the devil and of hell; thou must enter into the life of Christ, and do His commandments," etc. —Though *Arndt* adhered more firmly than Böhm to the fundamental principles of Lutheranism, he always urged the necessity of that *love* which proceeds from faith (see the passages quoted from his Wahres Christenthum, in *Hagenbach's* Vorlesungen, Bd. iii. s. 377–379). *Poiret* called that faith which manifests itself especially as an uncharitable spirit of opposition, *military* faith. (Ibid. iv. s. 327.)

§ 253.

The Economy of Salvation.

The fundamental principles laid down in the symbolical books were more fully developed by theologians, especially by those of the Protestant Church, so as to form a definite *economy of salvation.* After God has by grace called the sinner (vocatio), and man has heard that call (auditio), operations of the Divine Spirit (operationes Spiritus) follow each other in definite succession: 1. Illuminatio; 2. Conversio (pœnitentia); 3. Sanctificatio (renovatio); 4. Perseverantia; 5. Unio mystica cum Deo. Theologians, however, did not quite agree as to the precise order of these operations (1). The mystics, and the so-called pietists, neglected all those scholastic definitions, and had a system and terminology of their own (2).

(1) Compare the works of the orthodox Protestant theologians, cited in *De Wette,* Dogmatik, s. 151 ff. *Hase,* Hutterus Redivivus, p. 287 ss., where passages are also quoted from the writings of other divines; *Gass,* s. 362 ff., and the works of *Hülsemann* and *Musäus,* to which he refers.

(2) The theory of the economy of salvation was established on account of, and in opposition to, the pietists. See *De Wette,* s. 151. For their views concerning the so-called Theologia Irregenitorum, and the economy of salvation, see *Planck,* Gesch. der protest. Theol. s. 223 ff. The pietists

asserted that the regeneration of man commences with a change in his will; their opponents maintained that the illumination of the understanding was the first step. The conscious experience of the unio mystica raised some mystics to the height of ecstasy; with others it subsided into quietism. See *Molinos*, Guida Spirituale (extracts in *Scharling*, l.c. s. 55 ff.), and the appendix, s. 236. [This Spiritual Guide was published in Spain 1675; an English translation appeared 1688.] As no reference was made to the unio mystica in the symbolical books, theologians entertained different views.—On the controversy between the theologians of Leipzig and Wittenberg on the one hand, and those of Tübingen and Helmstädt on the other (which had its origin in the assertion of *Justus Feuerborn*, that there is an approximatio of the divine substance to the human), comp. *Walch*, Religions-Streitigkeiten der evangelisch-lutherischen Kirche, iii. s. 130 ff.

THIRD DIVISION.

THE DOCTRINES CONCERNING THE CHURCH AND ITS MEANS OF GRACE, CONCERNING SAINTS, IMAGES, THE SACRIFICE OF THE MASS, AND PURGATORY.

(THE PRACTICAL CONSEQUENCES.)

§ 254.

Introduction.

WITH the differences respecting the formal (1) as well as the material principle (2), which constitute Roman Catholicism on the one hand and Protestantism on the other, are intimately connected their respective views concerning the Church and its means of grace, concerning divine worship, especially the mass and the sacrifice of the mass, and concerning the effects of the latter upon the state of the dead (purgatory); or, more properly speaking, the views held on these subjects are the necessary consequences of the principles held on each side. But Protestants and Roman Catholics, as distinguished from the sects, were agreed in preserving the historical and positive basis of Christianity, though they differed as to extent and manner, and also in retaining external and lawfully ordered forms. On the other hand, the sects, rejecting more or less arbitrarily the historical development of Christianity and its higher influence in shaping the life of society, exposed themselves to the disintegrating power of separatism, now on the side of a dry reflection, and again in the way of fantastical mysticism (3).

(1) Wherever the so-called *abuses* of the Roman Catholic Church are mentioned in the symbolical writings of the Protestants, they are rejected chiefly because they are either not founded upon *Scripture*, or are directly opposed to it.

(2) The fundamental contrast between *faith* and *works* (the internal and external) manifests itself also in the doctrines in question. Where Protestants suppose an invisible order of things, Roman Catholics rely upon the external form, which strikes the senses; where the former seek ordinances and means of grace, the latter find opera operata, etc.

(3) Dissolution into fragments of churches, and disintegration into atoms, are the common fate of all sects. Another thing common to them all is the disregard they manifest to whatever is *symbolical* in public worship. They either despise it altogether as only captivating the senses, or they regard it as an empty ceremony.—While Protestantism was in some respects liable to foster such a development, it also included powerful principles of an opposite tendency, which gave rise to the organization of forms of worship and of ecclesiastical polity. The Calvinists rather endeavoured to build anew from the foundation, while the Lutherans were more attached to historical precedents.

§ 255.

The Church and Ecclesiastical Power.

Köstlin, Luthers Lehre von der Kirche, Stuttg. 1853. *Hansen*, Die lutherische und die reformirte Kirchenlehre von der Kirche, Gotha 1854. *Münchmeier* [Die sichtbare und unsichtbare Kirche, Götting. 1854. *William Palmer*, A Treatise on the Church of Christ, 3d ed. 2 vols. 1842. *Döllinger*, Kirche u. Kirchen; in Eng., The Church and the Churches]. *Dieckhoff*, Luthers Lehre v. der Kirchl. Gewalt, Berlin 1865. *Hase*, Polemik, s. 12 ff.

The old antagonism between the external and internal idea of the Church was more fully developed by the conflicts between Romanism and Protestantism. According to Roman Catholics, the Church is a visible society of all baptized persons, who adopt a certain external creed, have the same sacraments, and acknowledge the Pope as their common head (1). Protestants assert that the Church consists in the fellowship of all those who are united by the bonds of true faith, which

ideal union is but imperfectly represented by the visible Church, in which the gospel is truly taught, and the sacraments are rightly administered (2). In the view of the former, individuals come to Christ through the Church; in the view of the latter, they come to the Church through Christ (3). With this fundamental difference is connected the different view entertained by Protestants and Roman Catholics respecting the power of the Church and the hierarchy. Protestants not only reject the papacy, and all the gradation of ecclesiastical dignities in the Roman Catholic sense, but, proceeding from the idea of the spiritual priesthood of all Christians, regard the clergy not, like their opponents, as an order of men specially distinct from the laity, but as the body of the teachers and servants of the Church, who being divinely called and properly appointed, possess certain ecclesiastical rights, and have to perform certain duties which they derive partly from divine, partly from human law (4). In their opposition to the hierarchy, the Anabaptists and Quakers went still farther, rejecting not only the priestly, but also the teaching order, and made the right of teaching in the Church to depend on an *internal* call alone (5). [The Church of England occupied an intermediate position between the Roman Catholics and the other Reformed churches, retaining the Episcopate and the theory of apostolical succession (6), although not at first formally denying the validity of the orders of other churches (7), and vigorously opposing the pretensions of the papacy (8). The Presbyterian polity was shaped most completely in Scotland (9). Independency (Congregationalism) was planted in New England, and had a temporary triumph in England under Cromwell (10).[1]]

(1) After the example of Augustine (in his controversy with the Donatists), the Roman Catholics maintained that the Church militant on earth[2] is composed of good and evil. See

[1] [This, together with the notes, adapted from D. H. B. Smith.]

[2] The distinction which Roman Catholics make between ecclesia militans and triumphans has reference to this world, and to that which is to come; while the

Confess. August. Confut. c. 7, and Cat. Rom. i. 10, 7. It is in *Bellarmine's* treatise, Ecclesia Milit., in particular, that this doctrine is very clearly developed, c. 1: Nostra sententia est, ecclesiam, *unam* tantum esse, non duas, et illam unam et veram esse cœtum hominum ejusdem christianæ fidei professione et eorundem sacramentorum communione colligatum, sub regimine legitimorum pastorum ac præcipue unius Christi in terris vicarii, Romani pontificis. Ex qua definitione facile colligi potest, qui homines ad ecclesiam pertineant, qui vero ad eam non pertineant. Tres enim sunt partes hujus definitionis: Professio veræ fidei, sacramentorum communio, et subjectio ad legitimum pastorem, Romanum pontificem. Ratione primæ partis excluduntur omnes infideles, tam qui nunquam fuerunt in ecclesia, ut Judæi, Turcæ, Pagani, tam qui fuerunt et recesserunt, ut hæretici et apostatæ. Ratione secundæ excluduntur catechumeni et excommunicati, quoniam illi non sunt admissi ad sacramentorum communionem, isti sunt dimissi. Ratione tertiæ excluduntur schismatici, qui habent fidem et sacramenta, sed non subduntur legitimo pastori, et ideo foris profitentur fidem et sacramenta percipiunt. Includuntur autem omnes alii, etiamsi reprobi, scelesti, et impii sunt. Atque hoc interest inter sententiam nostram et alias omnes, quod omnes aliæ requirunt internas virtutes ad constituendum aliquem in ecclesia et propterea ecclesiam veram invisibilem faciunt; nos autem et credimus in ecclesia inveniri omnes virtutes, fidem, spem, caritatem, et ceteras; tamen ut aliquis aliquo modo dici possit pars veræ ecclesiæ, de qua scripturæ loquuntur, non putamus requiri ullam internam virtutem, sed tantum externam professionem fidei et sacramentorum communionem, quæ sensu ipso percipitur. Ecclesia enim est cœtus hominum ita visibilis et palpabilis, ut est cœtus populi Romani vel regnum Galliæ aut respublica Venetorum.

(2) On the gradual development of the idea of the Church in Luther's system, see *Schenkel*, Wesen d. Protest. iii. 1 ff., and *Köstlin*, l.c.; on *Zwingli's* views, see *Schenkel*, s. 61 ff. On *Calvin*, especially s. 99 ff. (comp. the fourth book of his Institutes). On the distinction made by *Zwingli* (Antibolum, 1524) between an ecclesia visibilis and an ecclesia invisibilis,

distinction made by Protestants between the visible and invisible Church has reference to this world only. Comp. *Schweizer*, ii. s. 663.

see *Neander*, Kath. u. Prot. s. 199. Conf. Aug., Art. 7: Est ecclesia congregatio sanctorum, in qua evangelium recte docetur et recte administrantur sacramenta. Apol. Confess. Aug. p. 144 ss.: Et catholicam ecclesiam dicit [articulus ille in Symbolo], ne intelligamus, ecclesiam esse politiam externam certarum gentium, sed magis homines sparsos per totum orbem, qui de evangelio consentiunt, et habent eundem Christum, eundem Spiritum Sanctum, et eadem sacramenta, sive habeant easdem traditiones humanas, sive dissimiles.—P. 148: Neque vero somniamus nos Platonicam civitatem, ut quidem impie cavillantur, sed dicimus existere hanc ecclesiam, videlicet vere credentes ac justos sparsos per totum orbem. First Confess. of Basel, Art. 5: "We believe in a holy Christian Church, that is, a communion of saints, the assembly of believers in the Spirit, which is holy, and an offspring of Christ, of which all those are citizens who truly confess that Jesus is the Christ, the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sins of the world, and who give evidence of their faith by works of love." Conf. Helv. II. c. 17: Oportet semper fuisse, esse, et futuram esse ecclesiam, id est e mundo evocatum vel collectum cœtum fidelium, sanctorum inquam omnium communionem, eorum videlicet, qui Deum verum in Christo servatore per Verbum Spiritum Sanctum vere cognoscunt et rite colunt, denique omnibus bonis per Christum gratuito oblatis fide participant. . . . Illam docemus veram esse ecclesiam, in qua signa vel notæ inveniuntur ecclesiæ veræ, imprimis vero verbi divini legitima vel sincera prædicatio. In opposition to the misunderstanding of ecclesia invisibilis: Non quod homines sint invisibiles, ex quibus ecclesia colligitur, sed quod oculis nostris absconsa, Deo autem soli nota, judicium humanum sæpe subterfugiat. Conf. Gall., Art. 27; Belg. 27: Credimus unicam ecclesiam catholicam seu universalem, quæ est congregatio sancta seu cœtus omnium vere fidelium christianorum, qui totam suam salutem in uno Jesu Christo exspectant, sanguine ipsius abluti et per spiritum ejus sanctificati atque obsignati. *Sancta hæc ecclesia certo in loco non est sita vel limitata, aut ad certas singularesque personas alligata, sed per totum mundum sparsa atque diffusa.*—Comp. Angl. 19, Scot. 16. [*Winer*, s. 161 (3d ed.); Westminster Confession, chap. xxv.: "The Catholic or universal Church, which is in-

visible, consists of the whole number of the elect, that have been, are, or shall be gathered into one, under Christ the Head thereof, is the spouse, the body, the fulness of Him that filleth all in all. The visible Church, which is also catholic or universal under the gospel (not confined to one nation as before under the law), consists of all those throughout the world that profess the true religion, together with their children; and is the kingdom of the Lord Jesus Christ, the house and family of God, out of which there is no ordinary possibility of salvation."] The doctrine concerning the Church is most acutely developed by *Calvin*, Instit. iv. 1 ss. Comp. *Henry*, Bd. ii. s. 90 ff. The *Arminians* (*Limborch*, Theol. vii. 1, 6) and the Mennonites adopted substantially the same principles as the Reformed. *Ris*, Conf., Art. 24. On the views of the Quakers and Socinians, see *Winer*, s. 168 [166, 3d ed.]. The latter in particular attached little importance to the doctrine concerning the Church. *Socinus* (Opp. t. i. 3): Quod si dicas, ad salutem necessarium esse, ut quis sit in vera Christi ecclesia, et propterea necessarium simul esse, ut veram Christi ecclesiam inquirat et agnoscat, negabo consecutionem istam. . . . Nam simulatque quis Christi salutarem *doctrinam* habet, is jam vel re ipsa in vera Christi ecclesia est, vel ut sit non habet necesse inquirere, quænam sit vera Christi ecclesia, id enim . . . jam novit. From this he infers: Quæstionem de ecclesia, quænam sive apud quos sit, quæ hodie tantopere agitatur, vel inutilem propemodum esse, vel certe non esse necessariam.—The principle *extra ecclesiam nulla salus* was also retained by the Protestant Church, though in a somewhat different sense. Comp. *Winer*, s. 169. It also concedes that the *true* Church is infallible (columna veritatis), see Confess. Aug. p. 148. The later orthodox Lutherans lay claim to this predicate exclusively for their (the Lutheran) Church, excluding not only Roman Catholics, but also Calvinists, from the Church; see Consensus Repetitus Fidei, Punct. 59 (in *Henke*, p. 44): Rejicimus eos, qui docent ad ecclesiam christianam pertinere non tantum Lutheranos et Græcos (sic), sed Pontificios etiam et Calvinianos.

(3) Thus *Calvin* (Inst. iv. 1, 2) laid some stress on the phraseology of the Apostles' Creed, where it is not said, Credo *in* ecclesiam, like credo in Deum, in Christum; but simply Credo ecclesiam. So, too, the Church is not a Church of priests

(cœtus Pastorum), ib. § 7. "*Protestantism demands obedience under Christ, and connects therewith the participation of the individual in the Church; Roman Catholicism, on the other hand, demands obedience under the hierarchy, and makes dependent thereon the participation of the individual in the blessings received from Christ.*" *Schenkel*, iii. 1, s. 18.

(4) On the connection between the Roman Catholic idea of the priestly office and the sacrifice of the mass, see Concil. Trident., Sess. 23, c. 1. On the other side, Apol. Confess. Aug. p. 201: Sacerdotum intelligunt adversarii non de ministerio verbi et sacramentorum aliis porrigendorum, sed intelligunt de sacrificio, quasi oporteat esse in Novo Testamento sacerdotium simile Levitico, quod pro populo sacrificet et mereatur aliis remissionem peccatorum. Nos docemus, etc. . . . Ideo sacerdotes vocantur, non ad ulla sacrificia velut in lege pro populo facienda ut per ea mereantur populo remissionem peccatorum, sed vocantur ad docendum evangelium et sacramenta porrigenda populo. *Luther* expressed himself as follows: "Every Christian man is a priest, and every Christian woman a priestess, whether they be young or old, master or servant, mistress or maid, scholar or illiterate." Opp., Altenb. i. fol. 522 (in *Spener*, Geistliches Priesterthum, Frankf. 1677, s. 76 ff.): "All Christians are, properly speaking, members of the clerical order, and there is no difference between them, except that they hold different offices (1 Cor. xii.). By baptism we are all consecrated to be priests (1 Pet. ii.). We do not want to be *made*, but *born*, priests, and to have our priesthood by inheritance, through our birth from our fathers and mothers; for our father is the true priest and high priest (Ps. cx.). Hence we take persons from such born priests, and call them to such offices. Papal or Episcopal ordination can only make hypocrites and dunces."[1] . . . Not only those "who are anointed and have received the tonsure"[2] are priests, "but every one who is baptized may consider himself an ordained priest, bishop, and pope, *though it does not belong to every one* to exercise the duties belonging to such offices. For though we

[1] [Germ. *Oelgötzen*. It may mean "oil-idols," men who are worshipped because they are anointed. In modern German, at least, it seems to have lost this meaning, and to retain only that given in the text.]

[2] [Perhaps a little less respectful: "greased and shorn," literally.]

be all priests, none must take upon himself, without our approval and choice, to do that to which we all possess equal rights. . . . The priestly office in the Christian Church ought not to be different from that of a steward. While he is in office he has precedence before others, but when he is removed from office he is a peasant or citizen like anybody else (in opposition to *character indelebilis*). Nor are women excluded from the general priesthood of Christians, but they must not teach publicly (1 Cor. xiv.). But all derive their priesthood from Christ, the sole High Priest." See also his Appeal to the Nobles of the German Nation (in *Walch*, x. s. 302 ff.): "Hence the bishop's consecration means only this, that he takes one out of the crowd instead of the whole body, who all have like authority, and commands him to exercise this authority for the others. Just as if ten brothers, the children of a king, should elect one to govern for them; they were all kings and of equal rights, and yet one of them is appointed to rule. To set it in a clearer light, if a company of pious Christian laymen were captured and sent to a desert place, and had not among them an ordained priest, and were all agreed in the matter, and elected one, and told him to baptize, celebrate mass, absolve, and preach, such an one would be as true a priest as if all the bishops and popes had ordained him." (Comp. x. s. 1858.) . . . "When, on the other hand, the popish parsons, to prove their priesthood, show their pates and grease, and long coats to boot, we are very willing to let them boast of their dirty trumpery, for we know that it is very easy to shear and grease a pig or sow, and put a long coat on the animal." Comp. *Luther*, De Capt. Babyl., and his treatise: Von der Winkelmesse und der Pfaffenweihe (Wittenb. 7th edit. s. 433 ff.). Comp. *Schenkel*, l.c. s. 16 ff., and *Köstlin*, s. 59 ff. The universal priesthood was also insisted on by *Zwingli* and *Calvin*. The former, in the concluding addresses at the first Zurich disputation (1523, see his Works, i. s. 199), calls the Catholic Church "the wife of Christ;" "since it follows that all who love the head are members and children of God" (Thesis 8). Accordingly (Thesis 62), there are no other priests "than those who preach God's word." Comp. *Calvin*, Instit. ii. 15. 6; iv. 18. 13, 16, 17.—The distinction made by Protestants between *sacerdotium* and

ministerium is very sharply and strikingly set forth in the Confess. Helv. II. Art. 18: Deus ad colligendam vel constituendam sibi ecclesiam, eandemque gubernandam et conservandam, semper usus est ministris, iisque utitur adhuc, et utetur porro, quoad ecclesia in terris fuerit. Ergo ministrorum origo, institutio, et functio vetustissima et ipsius Dei, non nova aut hominum est ordinatio. Posset sane Deus sua potentia immediate sibi adjungere ex hominibus ecclesiam, sed maluit agere cum hominibus per ministerium hominum. Proinde spectandi sunt ministri, non ut ministri duntaxat per se, sed sicut ministri Dei, utpote per quos Deus salutem hominum operatur. . . . Rursus tamen et hoc cavendum est, ne ministris et ministerio *nimium* tribuamus. . . . Diversissima inter se sunt sacerdotium et ministerium. Illud enim commune est christianis omnibus, ut modo diximus, hoc non item. Nec e medio sustulimus ecclesiæ ministerium, quando repudiavimus ex ecclesia Christi sacerdotium papisticum. Equidem in Novo Testamento Christi non est amplius tale sacerdotium, quale fuit in populo vetere, quod unctionem habuit externam, vestes sacras, etc. . . . quæ typi fuerunt Christi, qui illa omnia veniens et adimplens abrogavit.—In addition to piety, it is especially *theological knowledge* by which the teachers of the Church must be distinguished from the laity: Eligantur autem non quilibet, sed homines idonei, eruditione justa et sacra, eloquentia pia prudentiaque simplici, denique moderatione et honestate vitæ insignes. . . . Damnamus ministros ineptos, et non instructos donis pastori necessariis.—As regards the right to officiate as a minister, it is necessary also, in the Protestant Church, to be rite vocatus:[1] Nemo autem honorem ministerii ecclesiastici usurpare sibi, i. e. ad se largitionibus aut ullis artibus aut arbitrio proprio rapere debet. Vocentur et eligantur electione ecclesiastica et legitima ministri ecclesiæ, i. e. eligantur religiose ab ecclesia vel ad hoc deputatis ab ecclesia, ordine justo et absque turba, seditionibus, et contentione. For further passages quoted from other symbols, see *Winer*, s. 175.[2]

[1] On the different views of the Lutherans and Reformed (Ordinatio vaga) respecting ordination, see the Canon law.

[2] Socinians, in the doctrine respecting the Church, follow in substance the statements of the Protestant Confessions, but view the matter, when possible, in a still more external way. See *Fock's* Socinianismus, s. 690 ff., and note 2 above.

(5) On the views of the Anabaptists, see *Schenkel*, iii. 1, s. 88 ff. *Münzer's* positions, as given by *Strobel* (Leben Münzers), s. 19 ff.: Quis non septies spiritu sancto profusus fuerit, Deum audire et intelligere minime potest. . . . Vera ecclesia est, quæ audit vocem sponsi.—The Quaker principle is given in *Barclay*, Theol. Christ. Apol., Thes. 10: Sicut dono et gratia seu lumine Dei omnis vera cognitio in rebus spiritualibus recipitur et revelatur, ita et illo, prout manifestatur et in intima cordis receptum est, per ejus vim et potentiam unusquisque verus evangelii minister constituitur, præparatur, et suppeditatur in opere ministerii, et hoc movente, ducente, et trahente oportet evangelistam, pastorem Christianum, duci et mandari in labore et ministerio suo evangelico, et quoad loca, ubi, et quoad personas, quibus, et quoad tempora, quando ministraturus est. Porro, qui hujus habent auctoritatem, possunt et debent evangelium annunciare, licet humanis mandatis carentes et humanæ literaturæ ignari. E contra vero, qui hujus divini doni auctoritate carent, quamquam eruditione et scientia præditi et ecclesiarum mandatis et hominum auctoritate ut plurimum pollentes, impostores tantum et fraudatores, non veri evangelii ministri seu prædicatores habendi sunt. Præterea, qui sanctum et immaculatum donum acceperunt, sicut gratis accepere, ita et gratis distributuri sunt absque mercede vel pacto stipendio, absit, ut eo utantur sicut arte ad lucrandam pecuniam, etc. (Women are also permitted to teach. *Barclay*, Comment. 27.)

(6) [In the 39 Articles, Art. 19, *of the Church*, declares: The visible Church of Christ is a Congregation of faithful men, in the which the pure Word of God is preached, and the Sacraments be duly ministered according to Christ's ordinance in all those things that of necessity are requisite to the same. Art. 20 declares that the Church hath power to decree Rites and Ceremonies, and authority in Controversies of Faith: and yet it is not lawful for the Church to ordain anything that is contrary to God's word written. Art. 36 approves the Book of Consecration of Archbishops and Bishops, and Ordering of Priests and Deacons, lately set forth in the time of Edward the Sixth. —*Hooker's* Ecclesiastical Polity advocates the Anglican system with the greatest ability. See also Abp. *Potter*, Disc. of Church Government, 1724 (1838). *Parker's* Government of the Church,

1683. *Jeremy Taylor*, Episcopacy Asserted. *Richard Field* (1561–1616), Of the Church, pub. for Eccles. Hist. Soc., 4 vols., Camb. 1847–1852. *Thos. Jackson*, Of the Church, etc., in Works, vol. xii.—*Thos. Brett*, Account of Church Government, 1710; Divine Right of Episc., 2d ed. 1728.—*George Hickes*, Treatises on Christian Priesthood and Episcopal Order, 4th ed., Oxf. 1847, 3 vols. (Libr. Angl. Cath. Theol.). *Herbert Thorndike*, On the Government of the Churches, 1541 (Lib. Angl. Cath. Theol. 1844, vol. i.). Bp. *John Overall* (1559–1619), Convocation Book, Gov. of Church, 1690, Lib. Angl. Cath. Theol. 1844. *Peter Heylin*, Ecclesia Vindicata, in Hist. Tracts, 1681. Bp. *Stillingfleet*, Irenicum, a Weapon-salve for the Church's Wounds, or the Divine Right of particular Forms of Church Government, 1661 (Works, vol. ii.).—*General Works on Church Polity: Gibson's* Codex Juris Ecclesiast., 2 vols. fol. 1764; Sir *Henry Spelman* (1562–1641), Concilia, Decreta, Constitutiones, etc., 2 vols. fol. 1637–1664. *David Wilkins* (died 1745), Concilia; accedunt Constitutiones, etc., 4 vols. fol. 1736, new ed. in 8vo in course of publication at Oxf. *Jos. Bingham*, Antiquities of Christ. Church, new ed. 9 vols. 1840. On the *English Convocation*, see Abp. *William Wake*, State of the Church and Clergy of England, occasioned by a book entitled, The Rights and Powers of an English Convocation, fol., Lond. 1704. *T. Lathbury*, History of the Convocation of the Church of England, 2d ed., Lond. 1853. *J. W. Joyce*, England's Sacred Synods, Lond. 1855.]

(7) [On the position of the Church of England in respect to the validity of the orders of other churches, see *Wm. Goode*, Vindication of the Doctrine of the Church of England, etc., 1851; replies by the *Bishop of Exeter* and *Archd. Churton*. See also Bp. *John Cosin*, On the Validity of Orders; and the works on the Church by Abp. *Whately*.—Tracts for the Times, 1833, 1834, No. 74, Catena Patrum, Testimony of Writers in the English Church to the Apostolical Succession.—Bp. *Burnet*, in his Exposition of the Articles, says that their authors, and successors for half an age after, did "acknowledge the foreign churches . . . to be true churches as to all essentials of the Church," although somewhat "irregularly formed." Even *Hooker* concedes (Eccl. vol. vii. 14) "that there may be sometimes very just and sufficient reason to allow ordination

made without a bishop." Clergymen from the Continent, who received benefices in England, were only required to subscribe the Articles, not to be reordained. Abp. *Usher* said: "in places where bishops cannot be had, the ordination by presbyters standeth valid." Comp. *A. W. Haddan*, Apostolic Succession in the Church of England, Lond. 1869.]

(8) [On the *Controversy with Rome:* Cardinal *Bellarmine's* Notes of the Church refuted by Tenison, Kidder, Patrick, Williams, etc.; repr. 1840. *Brogden's* Catholic Safeguard (a collection of treatises), 3 vols., Lond. 1846. *Edmund Gibson* (1667–1748), Preservation against Popery (also a collection of tracts), 18 vols., Lond. 1848, 1849. *Jewel's* Apology. *Isaac Barrow* (1630–1677), Treatise of Pope's Supremacy. *Jeremy Taylor*, Dissuasive from Popery. *Crakanthorp*, Defens. Eccles. Angl., new ed. 1847. *Chillingworth's* Religion of Protestants (see § 225*b*). *Andrew Willet* (1562–1621), Synopsis Papismi, 5th ed. 1634, repr. 10 vols. 1852. *Henry Hammond* (1605–1660), Works, 4 vols. fol. 1774; on Schism; a Paræenesis, in defence against Romanists (vol. ii.). *Geo. Hickes*, Controversial Disc., and Corruptions of Church of Rome, 1705, 3d ed. 1727; he also edited Bp. *Joseph Hall* (1574–1656), in Works, vol. viii., on the Peace of Rome, etc. *John Sharp* (1644–1714), Works, vol. vii. (1754), on Roman Cath. Controversy. Abp. *Wm. Laud* (1573–1645), Relation of Conference with Mr. Fisher, 1624, in Works, vol. ii., Oxf. 1849; Rome's Masterpiece (in Remains), by *Wharton*, fol. 1700, vol. i. p. 567 sq. Bp. *Ed. Stillingfleet*, Rational Account of the Grounds of the Protestant Religion, 2d ed. 1681 (Works, vol. iv.). *Peter Francis Courayer* (born 1681, died 1776), Diss. on Validity of English Ordinations, and Defence of the same, new ed., Oxf. 1844. *William Cave* (1637–1713), Diss. on Gov. of Ancient Church, 1683.]

(9) [Presbyterian Church Government. Ratio ac Forma publice orandi Deum, etc., Genev. 1556 (drawn up by the English exiles in the Marian Persecution). *George Gillespie*, Aaron's Rod blossoming, or the Divine Ordinance of Church Government. Publ. by authority, Lond. 1646. *Cartwright*, vs. Abp. Whitgift. *Smectymnus*, An Answer to Bp. Hall's Divine Right of Episcopacy (the authors, whose initial letters make up the name of the book, were Steph. Marshall, Edm. Calamy,

Thos. Young, Matth. Newcome, and Wm. Spurstowe). *John Milton* wrote an Apology for Smectymnus; also a work on Prelatical Episcopacy against Wall and Usher, Reason of Church Gov. against Prelacy. *Edm. Calamy*, Vind. of Presb. Government, 1654.]

(10) [*John Cotton*, Doctrine of Church to which are committed the Keys, etc., 2d ed., Lond. 1643, 1644; Vindiciæ Clavium; Way of the Churches, against Baillie and Rutherford, 1648. Cotton's work made a convert of *John Owen;* he had previously brought *Thos. Goodwin* and *Philip Nye* over to his views.]

The definitions respecting the relation in which the *Church* stands to the *State*, depend on those concerning the nature of the Church. According to *Bellarmine's* definition, before mentioned, the Roman Catholic Church is a State quite as much as the Republic of Venice, etc. Accordingly, it is independent of every other (secular) State.—The Protestants also maintained that the Church, as the kingdom of God, is independent of all secular power; and when they committed the government of the visible Church more or less into the hands of the State, they had not the intention of founding for it that system of *cesaropapacy* subsequently established. In the historical point of view, it was of the greatest importance that the Reformers, in an age so full of commotions, should endeavour to maintain the authority of secular power as "an institution ordained by God," *first*, by securing it against the pretensions of the hierarchy, which undermined the existence of every State; and, *secondly*, by an energetic opposition to the anarchical notions of the Anabaptists. Thus it happened that, in most confessions of faith, the article "De Magistratu" was laid down as a political and moral dogma. Thus the Conf. Helv. II. 30: Damnamus itaque omnes magistratus contemptores, rebelles, reipublicæ hostes, et seditiosos nebulones, denique omnes, quotquot officia debita præstare vel palam vel arte renuunt. Comp. *Luther's* views in *Köstlin*, l.c. s. 163 ff. And inasmuch as the Reformers, at the same time, proceeded on the idea of a *Christian* magistracy (analogous to the theocratic kings of the Old Testament), some (*e.g. Zwingli*) were of opinion that the exercise of *ecclesiastical discipline* (the "extirpation of crimes") might well be left to the secular authority, without making it necessary to have a distinct ecclesiastical court; while others (as *Œcolampadius* and *Calvin*) retained the ecclesiastical institution of excommunication, but reduced it to its primitive apostolical form. Comp. *Schröckh*, Kircheng. seit der Reformation, iii. s. 84. *Henry*, Calvin, ii. s. 97. *Schenkel*, iii. 2, s. 338 ff. According to the first Confess. of Basel, Art. 7, the Christian Church inflicts the punishment of excommunication "*only as a corrective, and gladly receives the excommunicated persons back into her fellowship, when they have amended their scandalous life.*" For further passages from the symbolical books of the Protestant Churches, see *Winer*, s. 180. On the controversy begun by *Thomas Erastus* (Liebler) of Heidelberg, and the disputation which took place A.D. 1568, see *Beckhaus*, Ueber den Heidelb. Katech. l.c. s. 90 ff. Athenæ Raur. p. 428. *Vierordt*, Gesch. der Reform.

im Grossh. Baden, s. 474 ff. [*Pusey*, On Royal Supremacy, 1849. *W. E. Gladstone*, The State in its Relations with the Church, 2 vols., 4th ed. 1841.] A question of practical importance arose on the point, how far the civil power should co-operate in the suppression of heresy or error? While in the Wartburg, Luther warned the Elector as to staining himself with the blood of the false prophets. And he also taught that "heresy is a spiritual thing, which cannot be hewed with iron, or burnt with fire, or drowned in water" (in *Köstlin*, s. 187). To this was opposed the procedure of the governments in the case of the Anabaptists and anti-Trinitarians (Servetus). And yet they were defended by theologians, particularly in the Calvinistic Church. See the discussions in *Trechsel*, Servet, s. 265 ff. *Stähelin*, Calvin, i. s. 449 ff.

§ 256.

Further Development of the Doctrine concerning the Church.

Later Protestant theologians developed more fully the difference between ecclesia visibilis and ecclesia invisibilis (in addition to which the other distinction between ecclesia militans and ecclesia triumphans continued to be made). The ecclesia *visibilis* is either *universalis* (*i.e.* dispersed through the world) or *particularis* (*i.e.* some Church which has adopted a particular form). The particular Churches are either opposed to, or stand on friendly terms with, each other (1). As regards the organization of the visible Church (ecclesia synthetica), the Lutheran theologians made a distinction between the status ecclesiasticus, the status politicus, and the status œconomicus. Different views obtained among the Reformed (2); nor did they agree with the Lutherans as to the representation of the Church (ecclesia repræsentativa). But these formal distinctions were of less importance than the new life which *Spener* brought into the Church, by restoring the Protestant doctrine of the spiritual priesthood (3), and the work which *Thomasius* performed by advocating the so-called territorial system (4). The mystics and enthusiasts offered, like the sects of the Middle Ages, a constant opposition to all external ecclesiasticism, both Roman Catholic and Protestant (5).

(1) The passages relative to this distinction are quoted from

the works of the Protestant theologians by *De Wette* (Dogmatik, s. 191 ff.) and *Hase*, Hutterus Redivivus, s. 320 ff.

(2) See *Wendelin*, *Alsted*, and *Heidegger*, quoted by *De Wette*, l.c. s. 195. Comp. *Schweizer*, ii. s. 657 ff.—For the different forms of Church government (by consistories, presbyteries, etc.), see the Canon law.

(3) He advanced his views in his work entitled: "Das geistliche Priesterthum, aus göttlichem Wort kürzlich beschrieben und mit einstimmigen Zeugnissen gottseliger Lehrer bekräftigt," Frankf. 1677 (arranged in questions and answers). S. 7, Qu. 11: "Does the name of priest belong to none but preachers?" *Ans.* "No; preachers are not, properly speaking, priests officially, and that title is never applied to them in the New Test.; but they are called servants of Christ, stewards of the mysteries of God, bishops, presbyters, servants of the gospel, of the word of God, etc. The name priest is rather a name common to all Christians, nor does it belong to ministers in a different sense from that in which it belongs to other Christians." Qu. 12. "But are not the ministers alone the 'Geistliche'?" [specifically *clergy*, generically *spiritual*, perhaps we might translate "spiritualty" or "priesthood"]. *Ans.* "No; for this title also belongs to every Christian (Rom. viii. 5).—Sacrificing, praying, and blessing are priestly offices which every Christian may perform, and in which Christ alone possesses the dignity of high priest."—Nevertheless Spener admitted, like all Protestants, the necessity of the ministry. Qu. 26. "Are all Christians ministers, and have all the office to preach?" *Ans.* "No; it requires a special vocation to fulfil the ministerial office in the congregation *before* all and *over* all its members; therefore he who of himself assumes such powers over others, and encroaches upon the rights of the minister, commits sin; hence teachers and hearers are different persons," etc. (On the other hand, the laity possess the full right of searching the Scriptures. See § 243, note 7.)

(4) According to *Thomasius*, the reigning prince possesses the right of regulating the ecclesiastical affairs of his country, of banishing persons who disturb the peace of the Church, etc. But he himself cannot be subject to ecclesiastical discipline. Thomasius, however, did not give his unqualified assent to the

principle of *Hobbes:* Cujus regio, illius religio. Comp. his treatise: Von dem Recht evangelischer Fürsten in Mitteldingen oder Kirchenceremonien; it appeared 1692, in Latin, and was afterwards translated into German. Compare also the treatise entitled: Das Recht evangelischer Fürsten in theologischen Streitigkeiten, 1696; and other works referred to by *Schröckh,* Kircheng. seit der Reform. vii. s. 541, and *Luden,* l.c.

(5) *Böhm, Kuhlmann, Gichtel, Labadie, Anna Schürmann, Poiret,* and others vied with each other in invectives against the State Church and its ministers. *Poiret* called the theology of the latter, Theologia adulatoria seu culinaria; see *Arnold,* iii. s. 166. *J. Böhm* heaped reproaches upon the priests of Baal.

§ 257.

Worship of Saints and Images.

Hase, Polemik, s. 298 ff., 552 ff.

The Reformers combated the invocation and worship of saints (1); but the theologians of the Roman Catholic as well as of the Greek Church retained the practice, and endeavoured to defend it with the arguments brought forward at an earlier period by the scholastics (2), or to vindicate it against the charge of idolatry, by making use of idealizing interpretation (3). The same may be said with regard to the worship of images and relics (4), as well as ecclesiastical ceremonies in general. In all these particulars, the Reformed carried their opposition farther than the Lutherans (5).

(1) Protestants did not teach that *there are no saints in the eye of God,* but only rejected their invocation. See *Marheinecke,* Symbolik, iii. s. 439. Conf. Aug., Art. 21: De cultu Sanctorum docent, quod memoria Sanctorum proponi potest, ut imitemur fidem eorum et bona opera juxta vocationem. Sed Scriptura non docet invocare Sanctos seu petere auxilium a Sanctis, quia unum Christum nobis proponit mediatorem, propitiatorium, pontificem, et intercessorem: hic invocandus

est et promisit se exauditurum esse preces nostras; et hunc cultum maxime probat. Comp. Apol. p. 223 ss.—The Articles of Schmalkalden use much stronger terms, p. 310: Invocatio Sanctorum est etiam pars absurda errorum Antichristi, pugnans cum primo principali articulo et delens agnitionem Christi. Cat. Maj. (on the first [and second] commandment). In entire agreement with this are the Reformed symbols. Conf. Helv. II. Art. 5: Interim Divos nec contemnimus nec vulgariter de eis sentimus. Agnoscimus enim, eos esse viva Christi membra, amicos Dei, qui carnem et mundum gloriose vicerunt. Diligimus ergo illos ut fratres et honoramus etiam, non tamen cultu aliquo, sed honorabili de eis existimatione, denique laudibus justis. Imitamur item eos. Nam imitatores fidei virtutumque ipsorum, consortes item æternæ salutis, illis æternum apud Deum cohabitare et cum eis in Christo exultare desideriis votisque ardentissimis exoptamus. Adding the words of Augustine: Honorandi ergo sunt (Sancti) propter imitationem, non adorandi propter religionem.—Similar principles are laid down in the confessions of faith adopted by the Arminians and Socinians, see *Winer*, p. 47. [Bp. *Ridley*, Treatise on Image-Worship, in Tracts of Anglican Fathers, vol. ii.; Abp. *Wake*, On Idolatry, in *Gibson's* Preservative, vol. vi.]

(2) Conc. Trid., Sess. 25: (Doceant episcopi) Sanctos una cum Christo regnantes orationes suas pro hominibus Deo afferre, *bonum atque utile esse*,[1] suppliciter eos invocare et ob beneficia impetranda a Deo per filium ejus Jesum Christum, qui solus noster redemtor et salvator est, ad eorum orationes, opem auxiliumque confugere; illos vero, qui negant, Sanctos æterna felicitate in cœlo fruentes invocandos esse, aut qui asserunt, vel illos pro hominibus non orare, vel eorum, ut pro nobis etiam singulis orent, invocationem esse idololatriam, vel pugnare cum verbo Dei adversarique honori unius mediatoris Dei et hominum Jesu Christi, vel stultum esse, in cœlo regnantibus voce vel mente supplicare, impie sentire.—Concerning the *angels*, the Catech. Rom. 3. 2, 10 asserts: Invocandi sunt, quod et perpetuo Deum intuentur et patrocinium salutis nostræ sibi delatum libentissime suscipiunt.—Roman Catholics also retained the distinction made by the scholastics

[1] Hence the invocation of saints is not made a *necessary condition of salvation.*

between *invocatio* and *adoratio*.—For the symbols of the Greek Church, see *Winer*, s. 44–46.

(3) This was done, *e.g.*, by *Bossuet*, Exposition de la Doctrine de l'église catholique, p. 19: The Church, in teaching us that it is useful to pray to the saints, teaches us to invoke them in the same spirit, and in accordance with the same law of brotherly association, which induces us to seek assistance from our brethren living upon earth. . . . P. 27: It is in this manner that we honour the saints, in order to obtain by their intercession the graces of God; and the principal of these graces which we hope to obtain is that of imitating them, to which we are excited by the contemplation of their admirable examples, and by the honour which we render before God in their blessed memory. Those who will consider the doctrine which we have propounded, will be compelled to acknowledge that as we do not take from God any of those perfections which are proper to His infinite essence, so we do not ascribe to created beings any of those qualities or operations which can belong to none but God, which distinguishes us so entirely from idolaters, that it is impossible to understand why our opponents give us that title. . . . P. 30: For the rest, no Roman Catholic (? !) ever thought that the saints of themselves know our needs, nor even the desires on account of which we address to them secret prayers. The Church has been content to teach, in accordance with all antiquity (?), that such prayers are very profitable to those who offer them, whether the saints learn them by the ministry and intercourse of the angels, who, according to the testimony of Scripture, know what passes among us . . . or whether God Himself makes known our desires to them by a particular revelation, or, lastly, reveals to them our secret desires in His infinite essence, in which all truth is comprehended. Thus the Church has decided nothing as to the different means which God may be pleased to use for this purpose.

(4) Comp. *Winer*, s. 47 ff., where the passages bearing upon this point are quoted from the symbolical writings. Helv. II. Art. 4: Rejicimus itaque non modo gentium idola, sed et Christianorum simulacra. . . . Quis ergo crederet, umbram vel simulacrum corporis aliquam conferre piis utilitatem?[1] On the

[1] On *Zwingli's* relation to the art of the sculptor, and to art generally, see *Spörri*, s. 111 ff. His zeal was directed not against the art of sculpture as such,

other side, the Council of Trent commands, Sess. 25: Imagines Christi, Deiparæ Virginis, et aliorum Sanctorum in templis præsertim habendas, et retinendas, eisque debitum honorem et venerationem impertiendam, non quod credatur inesse aliqua in iis divinitas vel virtus, propter quam sint colendæ, vel quod ab eis sit aliquid petendum, vel quod fiducia in imaginibus sit figenda, veluti olim fiebat a gentibus, quæ in idolis spem suam collocabant: sed quoniam honos, qui eis exhibetur, refertur ad prototypa, quæ illa repræsentat.

(5) *Luther's* sermon against the Iconoclasts of Wittenberg. —Similar principles to those adopted by Luther were defended by *Schmid* in the disputation of Zürich; but his views were not adopted. During the period of the Interim, the Lutheran Church returned to many of the ceremonies of the Roman Church, which gave rise to the adiaphoristic controversy.— The minor sects in this respect took the side of the Reformed.

§ 258.

The Sacraments.

Hase, Polemik, s. 350 ff. *Neander*, Kathol. u. Protest. s. 195 ff.

The doctrine of the *seven sacraments*, which both the Greek and Roman Churches adopted (1), was rejected by the Reformers, who admitted (after some wavering) as scriptural only the two sacraments (2), Baptism and the Lord's Supper (3). These two, together with the word of God (4), constitute, in the Protestant view, the means of grace (adminicula gratiæ) which profit only the believer (5); on the contrary, the theologians of the Roman Catholic Church asserted the efficacy of the sacraments ex opere operato (6). But both Roman Catholics and Protestants alike agreed as to the necessity of the sacraments (in opposition to the Quakers) (7), and

but to the abuse of it in divine worship. "One learns nothing from an image of the form or bearing of the original, and therefore it is not of the least value. Indeed, to many it is hurtful, and especially to women." Answer to Valentin Compar (*Werke*, ii. 1, s. 41).

in their higher significance as the medium by which spiritual blessings are communicated, and not as mere ceremonies (in opposition to Arminians, Mennonites, and Socinians) (8). Only the strict Zwinglian theory limited the sacraments to the idea of a mere symbol of duty (9).

(1) Conc. Trid., Sess. 7, Can. 1: Si quis dixerit sacramenta sacræ legis . . . esse plura vel pauciora quam septem, videlicet baptismum, confirmationem, eucharistiam, pœnitentiam, extremam unctionem, ordinem, et matrimonium, aut etiam aliquod horum septem non esse vere et proprie sacramentum: anathema sit.—The reasons for the number seven are more fully developed in Catech. Rom. ii. 1, 20 (in *Winer*, s. 123), where their respective dignity is also determined, ii. 1, 22: Sacramenta non parem omnia et æqualem necessitatem aut dignitatem habent, atque ex iis tria sunt, quæ, tametsi non eadem ratione, tamen præ ceteris necessaria dicuntur: baptismus, pœnitentia, ordo; verum si dignitas in sacramentis spectetur, eucharistia sanctitate et mysteriorum numero ac magnitudine longe cæteris antecellit.—Conf. Orth. p. 154: *Ἑπτὰ μυστήρια τῆς ἐκκλησίας, τὰ ὁποῖα εἶναι ταῦτα· τὸ βάπτισμα, τὸ μύρον τοῦ χρίσματος, ἡ εὐχαριστία, ἡ μετάνοια, ἡ ἱερωσύνη, ὁ τίμιος γάμος, καὶ τὸ εὐχέλαιον· ταῦτα τὰ ἑπτὰ μυστήρια ἀναβιβάζονται εἰς τὰ ἑπτὰ χαρίσματα τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος.* The Greeks, however, considered Baptism and the Lord's Supper the principal sacraments, to which some added penance. Comp. *Winer*, s. 124.

(2) At first *Melanchthon* even doubted as to the propriety of making use of the word *sacrament* (which is not found in the Bible); see his Loci Communes, 1521 (in the Corpus Ref., ed. *Bretschneider*, p. 210): Quæ alii sacramenta, nos *signa* adpellamus, aut, si ita libet, signa *sacramentalia*, nam sacramentum ipsum Christum Paulus vocat.

(3) The two Catechisms of Luther and the Confession of Augsburg treat only of two sacraments, Baptism and the Lord's Supper, without excluding the other five. *Melanchthon* would have allowed ordination and marriage to be sacraments (see *Thiersch*, ii. p. 206), and he even admitted absolution (Apol. p. 167): Absolutio proprie dici potest sacramentum. But comp. the Loci, 1521 (Corp. Ref. p. 211): Duo sunt

autem signa a Christo in Evangelio instituta: baptismus et participatio mensæ Domini. *Luther* also spoke of three sacraments in his De Captiv. Babyl.: Baptismus, Pœnitentia, Panis. On the contrary, in the Catech. Major, p. 549, penance is included in baptism. The Apol. Conf. p. 200, is opposed to regarding seven as the fixed number: (Adversarii) jubent nos etiam septem sacramenta numerare. Nos sentimus præstandum esse, negligantur res et ceremoniæ in Scripturis institutæ, quotcunque sunt. Nec multum referre putamus, etiamsi docendi causa alii numerant aliter, si tamen recte conservent res in Scriptura traditas.—Yet the Apology also mentions penance among the sacraments: Vere igitur sunt sacramenta baptismus, cœna Domini, absolutio, quæ est sacramentum pœnitentiæ.—The number two is more definitely stated in the symbolical writings of the Reformed Church. Confess. Basil. I. Art. 5, § 2: In this Church we use only one kind of sacrament, viz. baptism, by which we are received into the Church, and the Lord's Supper in after life, as a testimony of faith and brotherly love, according to our promise in baptism.—Conf. Helv. II. c. 19: Novi populi sacramenta sunt baptismus et cœna dominica. Sunt qui sacramenta novi populi septem numerent. Ex quibus nos pœnitentiam, ordinationem ministrorum, non papisticam quidem illam, sed apostolicam, et matrimonium agnoscimus *instituta esse Dei utilia, sed non sacramenta.* Confirmatio et extrema unctio *inventa sunt hominum,* quibus nullo cum damno carere potest ecclesia. Comp. Conf. Gall., Art. 35; Belg. 33; *Calvin,* Instit. iv. c. 19. [Anglican, Art. 25: Sacraments ordained of Christ be not only badges or tokens of Christian men's profession, but rather they be certain sure witnesses, and effectual signs of grace, and God's good will towards us, by the which He doth work invisibly in us, and doth not only quicken, but also strengthen and confirm our faith in Him.—There are two sacraments ordained of Christ our Lord in the gospel, that is to say, Baptism and the Supper of the Lord.—Those five commonly called Sacraments, that is to say, Confirmation, Penance, Orders, Matrimony, and extreme Unction, are not to be counted for Sacraments of the Gospel, being such as have grown partly of the corrupt following of the Apostles, partly are states of life allowed in the Scriptures; but yet have not

like nature of sacraments with Baptism and the Lord's Supper, for that they have not any visible sign or ceremony ordained of God.—The sacraments were not ordained of Christ to be gazed upon, or to be carried about, but that we should duly use them. And in such only as worthily receive the same they have a wholesome effect or operation: but they that receive them unworthily purchase to themselves damnation, as Saint *Paul* saith.]

[Westminster Confession, chapter 27: Sacraments are holy signs and seals of the covenant of grace, immediately instituted by God, to represent Christ and His benefits, and to confirm our interest in Him: as also to put a visible difference between those that belong unto the Church and the rest of the world; and solemnly to engage them to the service of God in Christ, according to His word. 2. There is in every sacrament a spiritual relation or sacramental union between the sign and the thing signified, whence it comes to pass that the names and effects of the one are attributed to the other. 4. There be only two sacraments ordained by Christ our Lord in the gospel, that is to say, Baptism and the Supper of the Lord: neither of which may be dispensed by any but a minister of the word, lawfully ordained.] The Arminians also had only two sacraments. The Mennonites made mention of the washing of feet as a usage instituted by Christ (according to John xiii.); but *Ris* (Conf., Art. 30) knows only of two sacraments. Comp. *Winer*, s. 124.

(4) In the view of Protestants, the sacred Scriptures are not only the source of knowledge, but the word of God contained in them is a living and quickening principle. Both the law and the gospel have each their peculiar *ἐνέργεια*, the former that of bringing men to the knowledge of sin, the latter that of being the medium through which grace is bestowed on them (Art. Smalc. p. 319).—The Catech. Rom. (iv. 13, 18) also speaks of the word of God as a cibus animi, and places it on the same level with the sacraments, but understands by it the *prædicatio verbi* as sanctioned by the Church rather than the *Scriptures*.

(5) Confess. August. p. 11: Per verbum et sacramenta, tanquam per instrumenta, donatur Spir. S., qui fidem efficit, ubi et quando visum est Deo, in iis qui audiunt evangelium,

etc. Comp. Cat. Maj. p. 426; Art. Smalcald, p. 331; Form. Concord. p. 670.—Conf. Helv. II. cap. 1; Belg. 24; Heidel. Kat. Qu. 65: Whence cometh (saving) faith? *Ans.* The Holy Spirit produces it in our hearts by the preaching of the gospel, and confirms it by the use of the holy sacraments.[1]—On the other hand, the Protestant symbols are equally definite against the Roman Catholic doctrine: Confess. Aug. p. 13: Damnant illos, qui docent, quod sacramenta *ex opere operato* justificent, nec docent fidem requiri in usu sacramentorum, quæ credat remitti peccata. Apol. p. 203: Damnamus totum populum scholasticorum doctorum, qui docent, quod sacramenta non ponenti obicem conferant gratiam *ex opere operato*, sine bono motu utentis. Hæc simpliciter judaïca opinio est, sentire, quod per ceremoniam justificemur, sine bono motu cordis, h. e. sine fide. . . . At sacramenta sunt *signa* promissionum. Igitur in usu debet accedere fides. . . . Loquimur hic de fide speciali, quæ præsenti promissioni credit, non tantum, quæ in genere credit, Deum esse, sed quæ credit offerri remissionem peccatorum.—Helv. II. c. 19: Neque vero approbamus istorum doctrinam, qui docent, gratiam et res significatas signis ita alligari et includi, ut quicunque signis exterius participent, etiam interius gratiæ rebusque significatis participes sint, qualesquales sint. . . . Minime probamus eos, qui sanctificationem sacramentorum attribuunt nescio quibus characteribus et recitationi vel virtuti verborum pronuntiatorum a consecratore et qui habeat intentionem consecrandi.—But Protestant theologians also taught that the *integritas* of the sacrament did not depend on the dignity either of the person who administered it, or of him who receives it. Conf. Helvet. l.c. [Eng. Article 26: Although in the visible Church the evil be ever mingled with the good, and sometimes the evil have chief authority in the Ministration of the Word and Sacraments, yet forasmuch as they do not the same in their own name, but in Christ's, and do minister by His commission and authority, we may use their ministry, both in hearing the word of God and in receiving of the sacraments. Neither is the effect of Christ's ordinance taken away by their wickedness, nor the grace of God's gifts diminished from such as by faith and

[1] This in opposition to the enthusiasts.—On the division of the means of grace into δοτικὰ καὶ λητικά (*Quenstedt*, Syst. iv. p. 281), see *Gass*, i. s. 372.

rightly do receive the sacraments ministered unto them; which be effectual, because of Christ's institution and promise, although they be ministered by evil men.—Nevertheless, it appertaineth to the discipline of the Church, that inquiry be made of evil Ministers, and that they be accused by those who have knowledge of their offences; and finally, being found guilty by just judgment, be deposed.]

(6) *Cajetan* demanded of Luther the condemnation of the proposition: Non sacramentum, sed fides in sacramento justificat. *Planck*, Gesch. des prot. Lehrbegriffs, i. s. 144.—Thus also Conc. Trid., Sess. 7, Can. 8: Sacramenta continent et conferunt gratiam ex opere operato non ponentibus obicem. . . . Si quis dixerit, per ipsa novæ legis sacramenta ex opere operato non conferri gratiam, sed solam fidem divinæ promissionis ad gratiam consequendam sufficere: anathema sit. The further development of this doctrine by *Bellarmine*, De Sacram. ii. 1, is given by *Winer*, s. 125. Against the objections of the Protestants, Conc. Trid., Sess. xiv. c. 4: Quamobrem falso quidam calumniantur catholicos scriptores, quasi tradiderint, sacramentum pœnitentiæ absque bono motu suscipientium gratiam conferre, quod nunquam Ecclesia docuit neque sensit. Comp. *Thiersch*, ii. s. 210.

(7) The Quakers reject both the idea and the name of a sacrament. They acknowledge only the baptism of the Spirit and the mystical Lord's Supper. *Barclay*, Apol. xii. 12 (in *Winer*, s. 120).

(8) See the passages quoted by *Winer*, s. 122 f., and compare § 259, on the Lord's Supper. The difference referred to may (after the example of Winer) be so defined, that, according to Roman Catholics, Lutherans, and Calvinists, *God bestows* something on man by the medium of the sacrament, while those sects taught that *man renders* something to God (or *testifies* to something in the presence of men *before* God). Yet the idea of *service* on man's part is also contained in the Catholic view of sacrifice. See the next section.

(9) *Zwingli*, De vera et falsa Relig. p. 231: Sunt sacramenta signa vel *ceremoniæ* (pace tamen omnium dicam, sive neotericorum sive veterum), quibus se homo ecclesiæ probat aut candidatum aut militem esse Christi, redduntque ecclesiam totam potius certiorem de tua fide, quam te; si enim fides tua

non aliter fuerit absoluta, quam ut *signo ceremoniali* ad confirmationem egeat, fides non est: fides enim est, qua nitimur misericordiæ Dei inconcusse, firmiter, et indistracte, ut multis locis Paulus habet. Comp. Fidei Rat. ad Carol. V.: Credo, omnia sacramenta tam abesse ut gratiam conferant, ut ne afferant quidem aut dispensent. . . . Credo, sacramentum esse sacræ rei *h. e. factæ gratiæ* signum.—Klare Underrichtung vom Nachtmahl Christi (Works, ii. 1), s. 429: "A sacrament is the sign of a sacred thing. . . . Now the priests well knew that this word *sacrament* denotes nothing but a sign, nevertheless they left the simple-minded in the mistaken idea that it was something else, or something very precious, which they (the simple-minded) did not understand, but were induced to believe that the sacrament was God Himself." Annotatt. in Evang. Matth. (Opera, vi. p. 373): Ad hoc enim Christus sacramenta instituit, non ut his jam justitiam quæreremus aut collocaremus, sed ut per hæc admoniti et excitati ad veram cordis adeoque fidei justitiam penetraremus. Signa enim externa non justificant, ut quidam perhibent, sed justificationis per fidem admonent et vitæ innocentiam excitant.—In Evang. Marci, ib. p. 554: Nequaquam rejicienda sacramenta quæ Deus instituit, *sed summa cum religione et veneratione tractanda.*[1] Verum his tribuere quod solius est Dei, non minus est impium. Comp. his Expositio Fidei (Opera, iv. 2, p. 56): Sacramenta res sanctæ et venerandæ sunt, utpote a summo sacerdote Christo institutæ et susceptæ. . . . Testimonium rei gestæ præbent. . . . Vice rerum sunt, quas significant, unde et nomina eorum sortiuntur. . . . Res arduas significant. Ascendit autem cujusque signi pretium cum æstimatione rei, cujus est signum, ut si res sit magna, pretiosa, et amplifica, jam signum ejus rei eo majus reputetur. (Annulus reginæ uxoris tuæ, quo eam despondit tua majestas, illi non auri pretio æstimatur, sed pretium omne superat, etc.) . . . Auxilium opemque afferunt fidei. . . . Vice jurisjurandi sunt.—Comp. also the Catechism of *Leo Judä* (*Grob's* edition), s. 227: "As Christ will not break the bruised reed, nor quench the smoking flax, He has appointed for us, His members, while here in the flesh, two external *signs of duty*, that

[1] This does not harmonize with the heading given by *Schenkel*, i. 412 ff.: "*The Depreciation of the Sacrament by the Reformed.*"

our timidity may abate." S. 329: "A sacrament is an *oath* or *high duty:* those who speak to us of holy matters have called it a sign of sacred things, to present and image forth these things to us; whereby, too, those who make use of it *bind and pledge* themselves to these same holy things."—*Calvin* unfolds the idea of the sacrament in the 4th Book of his Institutes, cap. 14. He defines the sacrament, in § 1, as externum symbolum, quo benevolentiæ erga nos suæ promissiones conscientiis nostris Dominus obsignat, ad sustinendam fidei nostræ imbecillitatem, et nos vicissim pietatem erga eum nostram tam coram eo et angelis quam apud homines testamur. § 3: Ex hac definitione intelligimus, nunquam sine præeunte promissione esse sacramentum, sed ei potius tamquam appendicem quandam adjungi, eo fine, ut promissionem ipsam confirmet ac obsignet, nobisque testatiorem, imo ratam quodammodo faciat: quo modo nostræ ignorantiæ ac tarditati primum, deinde infirmitati opus esse Deus providet: neque tamen (proprie loquendo) tam ut sacrum suum sermonem firmet, quam ut nos in ipsius fide stabiliat, siquidem Dei veritas per se satis solida certaque est, nec aliunde meliorem confirmationem, quam a se ipsa accipere potest. Verum ut exigua est et imbecilla nostra fides, nisi undique fulciatur, ac modis omnibus sustentetur, statim concutitur, fluctuatur, vacillat adeoque labascit. § 9: Quamobrem . . . velim lectorem . . . non quasi *arcanam vim nescio quam* illis perpetuo insitam putem, qua fidem *per se* promovere aut confirmare valeant, sed quia sunt in hoc a Domino instituta, ut stabiliendæ augendæque fidei serviant.—§ 12, he calls the sacraments *pignora.* He refutes not only those who despise the sacrament, but also those (§ 14) qui arcanas nescio quas virtutes sacramentis affingunt, quæ nusquam illis a Deo insitæ leguntur.—The substance of the sacrament (materia et substantia) is Christ Himself (§ 16); they have in Him their soliditas. They are nothing separated from Him.—Calvin does not hold to a specific difference between the sacraments and the word. § 17: Quamobrem fixum maneat, non esse alias sacramentorum quam verbi Dei partes: quæ sunt offerre nobis ac proponere Christum, et in eo cœlestis gratiæ thesaurus: nihil autem conferunt aut prosunt nisi fide accepta.—He also calls the Old Testament types (Noah's

rainbow, etc.) sacraments (§ 18), and only distinguishes them from the New Testament sacraments by the fact that the former represent the promised Messiah in type, the latter testify to Him in fact (§ 20). Comp. § 26: Utraque paternam Dei in Christo benevolentiam ac Spiritus Sancti gratias nobis offerri testantur; sed nostra illustrius ac luculentius. In utrisque Christi exhibitio; sed in his uberior ac plenior. Comp. *Schenkel*, i. s. 425 ff., and the passages there adduced. Calvin endeavours to establish a mean between the extremes. Inst. iv. 17. 5, he says: Porro nobis hic duo cavenda sunt vitia: ne aut in extenuandis signis nimii, a suis mysteriis ea divellere, quibus quodammodo innexa sunt, aut in iisdem extollendis immodici, mysteria interim etiam ipsa nonnihil obscurare videamur.—According to the *Lutheran* view, on the other hand, the sacraments are not merely notæ professionis inter homines, but signa et testimonia voluntatis Dei erga nos ad excitandam et confirmandam fidem in his, qui utuntur, proposita. Cf. Conf. Aug., Art. 13.

§ 259.

The Sacrifice of the Mass. The Lord's Supper.

L. Lavater, Historia Controversiæ Sacramentariæ, Tigur. 1563, 1672. *H. Hospiniani* Historia Sacramentaria, Tigur. 1598, 1602, 2 vols. fol. 1611, 4to. The Works of *Luther* (*Walch*, vol. xvii. xx.). *Ebrard's* Abendmahl, ii.; *M. Göbel*, Luther's Abendmahlslehre vor und in dem Streite mit Carlstadt (Stud. u. Kritiken, 1843, 2). *Julius Müller*, Lutheri et Calvini Sententiæ de sacra Cœna inter se comparatæ, Hal. 1853, 4to. *A. W. Dieckhoff*, Die Evangelische Abendmahlslehre im Reformationszeitalter, Götting. 1854. [*K. F. A. Kahnis*, Die Lehre vom Abendmahle, 1851. *E. B. Pusey*, The Real Presence, the Doctrine of the English Church, Oxf. 1857. *The same:* The Doctrine of the Real Presence as contained in the Fathers, Oxf. 1855. *W. Goode*, The Nature of Christ's Presence in the Eucharist, 2 vols. 1856 (against Pusey, and in the Denison case). *R. J. Wilberforce*, Doctrine of Eucharist, 1853. Tracts for the Times, No. 81. *J. Harrison*, Answer to Dr. Pusey's challenge respecting the Real Presence, Lond. 1871, 2 vols.]

While the Reformers made common cause in their opposition not only to the doctrine of transubstantiation (1), but especially to the sacrifice of the mass (2), and the withholding

of the cup from the laity (3), all of which they rejected as unscriptural, they still differed widely in their opinions concerning the positive aspect of the doctrine of the Lord's Supper. Different interpretations of the words of the institution were at short intervals advanced by *Carlstadt* (4), *Zwingli* (5), and *Œcolampadius* (6). *Luther* opposed all these in his controversial writings (7), and in the Colloquium of Marburg (Oct. 1529) (8), and even to the close of his life he insisted upon the literal interpretation of the words of the institution of the Supper; and, as a consequence, upon the actual reception with the mouth of the glorified body of Christ, present in the bread, and of His real blood. In accordance with his views, the authors of the symbolical books of the Lutheran Church declared the doctrine of the real presence of Christ's body and blood in the Eucharist (Consubstantiation), and along with it (in part) that of the ubiquity of His body (9), to be the orthodox doctrine of the Church (10). The Reformed had never denied a presence of Christ in the Eucharist, though they did not expressly emphasize it (11). But they looked for this presence, as one which testified itself to *faith*, not in the bread, and interpreted the reception of Christ in the ordinance, not as that of His body received by the mouth, but as a spiritual participation (12). *Calvin* (13), in particular, after the example of *Bucer*, emphasized this spiritual participation, and thus made the Lord's Supper not a mere sign, but a pledge and seal of divine grace imparted to the communicant. Thus there always remained this important difference, that even in Calvin's view it is only the *believer* who is united with Christ in the sacrament; and that the body of Christ, as such, is not in the bread, but in heaven, from whence, in a mysterious and dynamic way, it is imparted to the communicant; while, on the contrary, Luther, from the objective point of view, maintained that the unbelieving also partake of the body of Christ, though to their own hurt, *in*, *with*, and *under the*

bread (14). The view of *Schwenkfeld* (15), resting upon a perversion of the words of institution, had but slight influence. The most prosaic view is that of the Socinians, Arminians, and Mennonites, who, in connection with their more negative opinions on the nature of the sacraments, regarded the Lord's Supper merely as an act of commemoration (16). And lastly, the Quakers believed that, in consequence of their internal and spiritual union with Christ, they might wholly dispense with partaking of His body (17). [The Westminster Confession is in harmony with the views of Calvin (18); the Independents and Baptists adopted substantially the theory of Zwingli. The Church of England, particularly in the Catechism, laid more stress upon the real presence, and in its earlier formularies upon the idea of the eucharistic sacrifice (19).]

(1) *Luther* combated the idea of transubstantiation both in his treatise, De Captiv. Babyl., and in his controversy with Henry VIII., who defended the scholastic doctrine. (Comp. *Walch*, xix.) [Henry VIII.: Adsertio septem sacramentorum adversus Mart. Lutherum, Lond. 1521, 4to, Rom. 1521 (the Pope granted to Henry in consequence the title Defensor Fidei); transl. by T. W., Lond. 1687.] Yet Luther himself made use of the expression transubstantiation (*Verwandlung*) in his Sermon on the Venerable Sacrament, 1519 (cited in *Ebrard*, ii. s. 112). The Symbols also declare against transubstantiation. Art. Smalc. p. 330: . . . De transsubstantiatione subtilitatem sophisticam nihil curamus, qua fingunt, panem et vinum relinquere et amittere naturalem suam substantiam et tantum speciem et colorem panis et non verum panem remanere. Form. Conc. p. 729: Extra usum dum reponitur aut asservatur (panis vel hostia) in pyxide aut ostenditur in processionibus, ut fit apud Papistas, sentiunt non adesse corpus Christi. P. 760: Negamus elementa illa seu visibiles species benedicti panis et vini adorari oportere.—Comp. Conf. Helv. II. Art. 21 (p. 74, *Augusti*). On the other side, Conc. Trid., Sess. 13, Can. 4: Denuo hoc sancta synodus declarat, per consecrationem panis et vini conversionem fieri

totius substantiæ panis in substantiam corporis Christi, et totius substantiæ vini in substantiam sanguinis ejus, quæ conversio convenienter et proprie a sancta catholica ecclesia *transsubstantiatio* est appellata. Comp. Cat. Rom. II. 4. 37. *Bellarmine*, Controv. de Sacram. Euch. iii. 18–24.

(2) It was not only the theology of the Reformers, but also the common sense of the people, which opposed *the sacrifice of the mass*, as well as the worship of images. At least in the Swiss Reformation these two points were closely connected with each other. Thus at the second disputation of Zürich (*Zuinglii* Opera, ed. *Schulthess*, i. p. 459 ss.). Among the many works either for or against the mass, compare the following: Ob die Mess ein Opffer sey, beyder parteyen Predicanten zu Basel antwurt uff erforschung eins Ersamen radts eingelegt, 1527. (The Reformed Church was led by *Œcolampadius*.)—"*No part of the Roman Catholic doctrine has met with more violent opposition on the part of the Reformers than the mass, which is rejected in the symbolical writings of the Lutherans as well as the Reformed Church, not only in strong terms, but even with abhorrence*," *Winer*, s. 148. To the mass as such *Luther* and his followers did not object. "The nearer," said Luther, "our masses are to the first mass of Christ, the better without doubt they will be; the greater the distance between them, the more pernicious they are." (Sermon von dem N. Test. 1520.) We meet with similar language in the symbolical writings of the Lutheran Church, *e.g.* the Confess. Aug. p. 23: Falso accusantur ecclesiæ nostræ, quod Missam aboleant; retinetur enim Missa apud nos, et summa reverentia celebratur. Servantur et usitatæ ceremoniæ fere omnes, præterquam quod latinis cantionibus admiscentur alicubi germanicæ, quæ additæ sunt ad docendum populum.—On the other hand, the *sacrifice* of the mass, and the abuses to which it gave rise, such as private masses, masses for the dead, etc., were rejected, p. 25: Accessit opinio, quæ auxit privatas Missas in infinitum, videlicet, quod Chr. sua passione satisfecerit pro peccato originis, et instituerit Missam, in qua fierit oblatio pro quotidianis delictis, mortalibus et venialibus. Hinc manavit publica opinio, quod Missa sit opus delens peccata vivorum et mortuorum ex opere operato. . . . De his opinionibus nostri admonuerunt,

quod dissentiant a scripturis sanctis et lædant gloriam passionis Christi. Nam passio Christi fuit oblatio et satisfactio, non solum pro culpa originis, sed etiam pro omnibus reliquis peccatis. . . . Jam si Missa delet peccata vivorum et mortuorum ex opere operato, contingit justificatio ex opere Missarum, non ex fide, quod Scriptura non patitur. Comp. Apol. Conf. p. 250, 269. A definite distinction is made between *sacramentum* and *sacrificium*, in Art. 12, § 17 (p. 253): Sacramentum est ceremonia vel opus, in quo Deus nobis exhibet hoc, quod offert annexa ceremoniæ promissio, ut Baptismus est opus, non quod nos Deo offerimus, sed in quo Deus nos baptizat, videlicet minister vice Dei, et hic offert et exhibet Deus remissionem peccatorum. . . . E contra sacrificium est ceremonia vel opus, quod nos Deo reddimus ut eum honore afficiamus. (Expiatory sacrifice and thankoffering: the latter to be brought by believers, but not ex opere operato, sed propter fidem.) Art. Smalc. p. 305: Quod Missa in papatu sit maxima et horrenda abominatio et hostiliter e diametro pugnans contra articulum primum, quæ tamen præ omnibus aliis pontificiis idololatriis summa et speciosissima fuit. Form. Conc. p. 602. —*Calvin* speaks very strongly against the mass, Instit. iv. 18, 18: Certe nulla unquam validiore machina Satan incubuit ad oppugnandum expugnandumque Christi regnum. Hæc est Helena, pro qua veritatis hostes tanta hodie rabie, tanto furore, tanta atrocitate digladiantur, et vere Helena, cum qua spirituali fornicatione (quæ omnium est maxime exsecrabilis), ita se conspurcant. And so in the symbolical writings of the Reformed Church the mass is entirely rejected, nor is a distinction made between the earlier and the later mass. Heidelb. Katech., Qu. 80. . . . Hence the mass is in reality nothing but a denial of the one sacrifice of Christ, and an execrable idolatry. Conf. Helv. II. c. 21: Missa, qualis aliquando apud veteres fuerit, tolerabilis an intolerabilis, modo non disputamus; hoc autem libere dicimus, Missam, quæ hodie in usu est per universam Romanam ecclesiam, plurimas et justissimas quidem ob caussas in ecclesiis nostris esse abrogatam.—On the other side are the symbolical writings of the Roman Catholic Church. Conc. Trid., Sess. 22. Can. 1: Si quis dixerit, in Missa non offerri Deo verum et proprium sacrificium, aut quod offerri non sit aliud, quam nobis Christum ad

manducandum dari: anathema sit. . . . Can. 3: Si quis dixerit, Missæ sacrificium tantum esse laudis et gratiarum actionis, aut nudam commemorationem sacrificii in cruce peracti, non autem propitiatorium, vel soli prodesse sumenti, neque pro vivis et defunctis, pro peccatis, pœnis, satisfactionibus et aliis necessitatibus offerri debere: anathema sit. *Bellarmine*, Controv. de Euch. lib. 5 and 6, the principal passages of which are quoted by *Winer*, s. 148.—In the Confess. Orthod. of the Greek Church also, p. 165, the Eucharist is called *ἀναίμακτος θυσία*. For further statements, see *Winer*, s. 149.—The fuller development of the arguments advanced by Roman Catholic theologians, especially *Bellarmine*, in support of the idea of a sacrifice, will be found in *Marheinecke*, Symbolik, iii. s. 351 ff. Particularly remarkable are the exegetical arguments, *e.g.* that derived from the phrase: Hoc *facite* in memoriam meam, where it is maintained that facere is used in the sense of sacrificing, analogously to the Hebrew word עָשָׂה (Ex. xxix. 41; Num. xv. 3; Ps. lxvi. 15), or that derived from the history of Melchisedec, where they assign to the word הוֹצִיא the meaning of sacrificing, because it is translated *ἐξήνεγκε* (obtulit) by the LXX. See *Marheinecke*, l.c. s. 377 f.

(3) Confession of Augsb. p. 21; Apol. p. 223; Art. Smalc. p. 330; Formula Concordiæ, p. 602; Conf. Helv. II. c. 21: Improbamus illos, qui alteram speciem, poculum inquam Domini, fidelibus subtraxerunt. Graviter enim peccant contra institutionem Domini. Confess. Angl. p. 94; Conf. Scot., Art. 22; Decl. Thorun. p. 64. Consensus Repet. Fidei veræ Luth. (ed. *Henke*), p. 53.

(4) *Carlstadt* thought the words used by our Saviour at the institution of the Eucharist were to be understood *δεικτικῶς* (*i.e.* that Christ, in pronouncing them, pointed to His body).[1]

[1] In the opinion of *Zwingli*, the views of Carlstadt were correct in the main, but "he did not show himself very skilful in the interpretation of the word *τοῦτο*, which he evidently misunderstood," and "on the whole he was rather unhappy in his expressions." See his treatise: Ueber des Dr. Strussen Büchlin, in *Schuler* and *Schulth.* ii. 1, s. 479. Carlstadt was not, however, the originator of this view. It is found so early as 1420 among the Picards in Bohemia (see *Herzog*, xi. 644). Comp. the passage in the Chronicle of the Hussite Mag. Laur. de Brezina, in *Höfler*, Gesch. der Hussitischen Bewegung, Bd. i. s. 412 ff., and in *Krummel*, Gesch. der Böhm. Reformation im 15ten Jahrh. (Gotha 1866), s. 52.

Comp. *Walch*, Bd. xv. s. 2422 ff., xx. s. 186 ff. *M. Göbel* in the Studien und Kritiken, 1841, 1842.

(5) *Zwingli's* first statements about the doctrine of the Lord's Supper were made in opposition to the Roman sacrifice of the mass. In the interpretation of the 18th article (Werke, i. s. 257), in the year 1523, he says: "I called the eating and drinking of the body and blood of Christ *a memorial of the passion of Christ*, before I heard of the name of Luther; and Luther called the body and blood of Christ a testament; both statements are correct, and come from the mouth of Christ." Comp. his letter to Wyttenb., June 15, 1523 (Opera, vii. p. 297). But Zwingli does not recognise the element of *life-union with Christ*. This is especially marked in his treatise, De Canone Missæ (Opera, iii. p. 114 ss.), written in August of the same year, where he speaks of eating the body and drinking the blood of Christ (in the older ascetic spirit of the Church); see the passages in *Ebrard*, ii. s. 107. In a sermon delivered at Bern in 1528, he speaks of being fed with the body of Christ for the resurrection (Werke, ii. s. 212 ff.; *Ebrard*, ii. s. 110). In his work entitled, Christenliche Ynleitung (1523, Werke, i. s. 563 f.), he says that the Supper is a food for the soul, and a visible sign of His flesh and blood.—The first document of Zwingli's teaching in relation to the Saxon controversy respecting the sacrament is the letter addressed to Matthias Alber of Reutlingen, in the Subsidium de Eucharistia, which forms an appendix to his Comment. de Vera et Falsa Religione, Opera, iii. p. 327 (1525), and is to be compared with his treatise, Klare Underrichtung vom Nachtmahl Christi (1526); then the treatise, Amica exegesis, *i.e.* Expositio Eucharistiæ Negotii ad M. Lutherum (1527); the work, Dass diese Worte Jesu Christi "das ist myn lychnam, etc.," ewiglich den alten eynigen Sinn haben werdend, etc., and in several other controversial writings (*e.g.* that wider des Doctor Strussen Büchlin), comp. *Schuler's* edit. Deutsche Werke, ii. 2, and iii., Opp. Lat. iii. 1. Comp. *Ebrard*, ii. s. 136 ff. The following passages may suffice as an exposition of his views.

(*a*) In respect to the symbolical or metabolical interpretation of the words of institution: Subsidium de Eucharistia, p. 343 (referring to Ex. xii. 11): Ita igitur vox *est*, hoc loco, citra

omnem parabolæ suspicionem posita est. . . . Quis tam tardus erit, ne dicam hebes aut pertinax, ut non videat, *est* h. l. positum esse pro *significat;* aut symbolum est, aut figura est. . . . Quid nunc, quæso, causæ est, cur eundem tropum nolint quorundam mentes recipere in constitutione novæ et eternæ gratiarum actionis? cum omnia sic conveniant, sic sibi respondeant, ut qui eis credere nolit, disperdere videatur, non ædificare velle. (It is also urged that Christ Himself was still with His disciples, and could not give them to eat either the body that was yet to be crucified, or the body translated to heaven.) Compare his response to Bugenhagen, Opera, p. 605 ss., and Klare Underrichtung (Werke, ii. 1), s. 456: "Thereby we must know that the Scripture is everywhere full of figurative expressions, which in Greek they call *tropos*, which are to be understood or explained by something else. As when Christ says, I am the vine . . . ye are the branches. . . . Item, John i. 29, Behold the Lamb of God, that taketh away the sin of the world. . . . John vi. 35, I am the living bread (and other like passages)." Comp. his work, Dass diese Worte Jesu Christi: Dat ist myn Lychnam, etc., ewiglich den alten einigen sinn haben werdend, etc. (Werke, ii. s. 16 ff.). At the Marburg Conference he also cited the passage, John xix. 26. Woman, see, this *is* thy son!—In respect to the μεταβολή, Zwingli agrees entirely with the older Fathers. The bread of the supper ceases to be *common* bread, and becomes *holy* (sacramental) by its *relation* to Christ. See his Sermon at Bern (Werke, ii. s. 270): "Just as a flower is more noble when it is put in the wreath of a bride, though as to its matter it be one and the same; and as one is otherwise treated who takes to a king his signet-ring than if he had taken only so much gold, though the matter be one and the same: so here, too, the matter of the bread is the same, *but the breaking thereof and the dignity of the Lord's Supper give it such value, that it is not like other bread.*"

(*b*) In respect to the efficacy of the sacrament: Subsidium, p. 332: *Fide* constat salus, non *corporali manducatione*, neque ea fide, qua te fingas credere quidquid finxeris, sed qua fidis *filio Dei pro te in cruce impenso.* Klare Underrichtung, s. 441: Christ means by "eating His flesh and blood" nothing more than *trust in Him, who has given His flesh and blood for our*

life. "To trust in Him is salvation, but to eat, see, touch Him, is not." Ueber des Dr. Strussen Büchlin (Werke, ii. 1, s. 481): "Our controversy is not chiefly as to whether the body of Christ *is in the sacrament,* but *whether it is therein eaten bodily;* although it is not there, nor can be, according to God's word." (On the doctrine of the body of Christ in heaven, in relation to this matter, see in the Christology below.) Zwingli speaks of a presence of the body of Christ to *faith,* in his Fidei Ratio ad Carol. Imp.: Credo, quod in sacra eucharistiæ h. e. gratiarum actionis cœna *verum Christi corpus adsit fidei contemplatione.* . . . Sed quod Christi corpus per essentiam et realiter h. e. corpus ipsum naturale in cœna aut adsit aut ore dentibusque nostris manducetur, quemadmodum Papistæ et quidam, qui ad ollas Ægyptiacas respectant, perhibent, id vero non tantum negamus, sed errorem esse, qui verbo Dei adversatur, constanter adseveramus.—"*The question, What is the Lord's Supper in relation to the objective life and faith of each individual? was foreign to Zwingli's thoughts; he only had in view the relation which the sacrament in the Church as a whole has to the death of Christ.*" *Ebrard,* ii. s. 155.

(6) The interpretation adopted by *Œcolampadius,* it is usually claimed, differed only grammatically from that of Zwingli. He retained the literal meaning of ἐστί, but took the predicate τὸ σῶμά μου in a figurative sense. But this vanishes when it is remembered that Zwingli was also willing, instead of *significat,* to say, *est symbolum.* See note 5, and *Ebrard,* ii. s. 152. Œcolampadius first unfolded his views in his treatise, De Verborum Domini: Hoc est corpus meum . . . juxta vetustissimos Auctores Expositione Liber, 1525 (see *Herzog,* Leben Oekolamp. i. s. 322 ff.; *Ebrard,* ii. s. 162; *Dieckhoff,* s. 514 ff.), in which he avoids direct opposition to Luther,[1] and chiefly contends against the mediæval scholasticism, starting with Peter the Lombard, and making use of Augustine's definition of a sacrament. The work is full of subtle remarks on the tropical element in the Bible.—*Johann*

[1] On the other hand, he does not generally spare the views of the opponents: Barbaries plusquam Scythica vel Diomedea est in panis *involucro* ceu in *ænigmate* ipsam hospitis canem quærere. Rusticitas est et stupor, non observare nec agnoscere, in quo hospes benevolentiam suam doceat, et pro spirituali carnalem requirere cœnam.

Brenz, Erhard Schnepf, and others opposed his views in the Syngramma Suevicum (see *Hartmann* und *Jäger*, Joh. Brentz, Hamburg 1842, i. s. 141 ff.; *Ebrard*, ii. s. 168 ff.), in which special emphasis was laid upon the *Word*, which was said to be joined with the bread in a wonderful manner; and it was thence inferred that there was a real (bodily ?) participation of the body of Christ. On the interpretation of the Syngramma, however, older and more recent divines are divided; see *Dieckhoff*, s. 570, 582, 619; and comp. *Keim*, Die Stellung der Schwäbischen Kirche zur Zwinglisch-lutherischen Spaltung (in Zellers Theol. Jahrbb. 1854, 4). In reply, *Œcolampadius* published his Antisyngramma (De Dignitate Eucharistiæ, sermones duo, 1526). He further engaged in a controversy with Pirkheimer, Billican, and Luther himself. Compare also his important dialogue, Quid de eucharistia veteres tum Græci, tum Latini senserint, Dialogus, in quo Epistolæ Philippi Melanchthonis et J. Œcolampadii insertæ, auctore Joan. Œcolampadio, 1530.

(7) On the earlier struggles of *Luther*, in which he was tempted to adopt the symbolical interpretation, see his letter to the Christians of Strassburg (quoted by *De Wette*, ii. s. 577). The first of Luther's writings in which he enters more fully into the question of the significance of the Lord's Supper, is his "Sermon ven dem hochwürdigen Sacrament," 1519, on which see *Dieckhoff*, s. 195 ff. *Kahnis* finds in it "*a mystic bridge* (!) *between the mediæval and the reformed views of Luther.*" He here says, "Hence, to partake of this sacrament of bread and wine only means to participate in a *certain sign* of this fellowship and incorporation with Christ and all believers." Here, too, *faith* is expressly demanded, if the Supper is to be of any avail. But in his treatise, Vom Anbeten des Sacraments, an die Böhmischen Brüder, 1523 (*Walch*, xix. s. 1593), he refuted not only the theories of transubstantiation, and of the sacrifice of the mass, but also that of a mere symbol, as well as that of a purely spiritual participation. Comp. *Gieseler*, iii. 1, s. 189. After the two last theories had found many supporters among the adherents of the Reformation, Luther zealously opposed (at first in letters addressed to several persons, *e.g.* Reutlinger, quoted by *De Wette*, iii. s. 70) those "who will now teach

us that in the sacrament of the altar there is nothing but bread and wine, and not the very body and blood of Christ," and directed attention to the differences obtaining among them as to the interpretation of the words of institution. Afterwards he combated the "Sacramentarians, enthusiasts," etc., in his "Sermon von dem Sacrament des Leibs und Bluts Christi" (published towards the close of the year 1526), and in his treatise, "Dass die Worte Christi: das ist mein Leib, etc., noch fest stehen, etc.," and above all in his "Grosses Bekenntniss," published 1528 (all these works are in *Walch*, xx.). Luther rested his theory, first on the literal interpretation of the words of our Saviour, which, in his opinion, is alone admissible:[1] "For we are not such fools as not to understand those words. If such words are not clear, I do not know how to talk German. Am I not to comprehend what is meant, when a person puts a loaf of bread before me, and says: Take, eat, this is white bread? and again, Take, drink, this is a glass of wine? In the same manner, when Christ says: Take, eat, this is my body, every child must understand that He speaks of that which He gives to His disciples" (*Walch*, xx. s. 918). Thus, at the Marburg Colloquy, Luther wrote upon the table the words, Hoc est corpus meum, and insisted upon it so strongly, as to assert, that if God commanded him to eat crab-apples or dung, he would do it.[2] In accordance with this literal interpretation, Luther taught the *real presence of Christ's body in the bread* (consubstantiality), although he defended himself against the charge of a gross impanation, which had been brought forward by his opponents: "We poor sinners are not so foolish as to believe that the body of Christ exists in the bread in the same visible manner in which bread is in the basket, or wine in the goblet, as the enthusiasts would lay to our charge, in order to deride our foolishness. . . . That the Fathers, and we also, sometimes speak in this way, is simply because we believe that Christ's body is there; otherwise we are quite

[1] In his letter addressed to the Christians of Strassburg, referred to above, he said: "The language is too forcible to be torn from its obvious meaning by words."

[2] He tries to make the tropical interpretation ridiculous, in a very sweeping fashion, in his treatise, Dass diese Worte . . . noch fest stehen (*Walch*, xx. 590). See, *e.g.*, what he says of the cuckoo and ground sparrow.

willing that any one should say: Christ is *in* the bread, or is *the* bread, or is *there*, where the bread is, or as He likes. We will not quarrel about words (?), but merely insist upon keeping to the literal meaning, that it is not simply bread of which we partake in the Lord's Supper, but the body of Christ" (*Walch*, l.c. s. 1012).—In the same place he adverts to the fact that God has other means by which He can enable one thing to be in another than those commonly known to us, such as wine being in the barrel, bread in the basket, money in the pocket. Thus Levi was in the loins of Abraham (Heb. vii. 5); heaven and earth may be in man's eye, etc. Comp. his "Grosses Bekenntniss," s. 1186. A thing may be present localiter (circumscriptive), definitive, repletive. But Christ is always present in the bread in a way that is above our reason, and which can only be perceived by faith: "How it takes place, thou canst not know, but thy heart feels Him, and by faith thou art convinced of His presence" (*Walch*, xx. s. 922, and many other passages). And yet at the Marburg Colloquy he said that the body was in the bread, as the sword in the sheath, etc. And in the Cassel Declaration he even says, in so many words: "This is the sum of our opinion, that the body of Christ is really eaten in and with the bread: so that all which the bread does and suffers, the body of Christ does and suffers, so that it is divided, eaten, bitten with the teeth, propter unionem sacramentalem" (*Planck*, iii. s. 368; *Ebrard*, ii. s. 375). Compare, however, the Formula Concordiæ, cited below.

(8) On the colloquy at Marburg, comp. *Walch*, xvii. s. 2361 ff. *Bullinger*, ii. s. 223 ff. *L. J. K. Schmitt*, Das Religionsgespräch zu Marburg, 1529, and *Gieseler*, Kg. iii. 1, s. 236, where the literature and the documents are given. *Ebrard*, s. 286 ff. Die 15 Marb. Artikel nach dem Original veröffentlicht, von *H. Heppe*, Marb. 1848. (Zeitschrift f. Hist. Theol. 1848, 1.)

(9) *Luther* was led, logically, to the theory of the ubiquity of Christ's body, which, however, he did not propound till a later period of his life. Comp. *Rettberg*, Occam und Luther (in Studien und Kritiken, 1839, Heft 1). The idea of ubiquity, however, was for a long time a fluctuating one. If the body of Christ was everywhere, it was in every piece of

bread; and so nothing was proved for the specific presence in the Lord's Supper. Hence, theologians were afterwards led to make more exact definitions of the idea. See *Ebrard*, ii. s. 698 ff., and the Christology below. *Calixt* called the ubiquitarian controversy infaustum certamen, but was on this account called a heretic by the orthodox; see *Gass*, s. 65.

(10) Conf. Aug. p. 12: De cœna Domini docent, quod corpus et sanguis Christi vere adsint et distribuantur vescentibus in cœna Domini, et improbant secus docentes. Comp. Apol. of Conf. p. 157. Art. Smalc. p. 330: De sacramento altaris sentimus, panem et vinum in cœna esse verum corpus et sanguinem Christi, *et non tantum dari et sumi a piis, sed etiam ab impiis christianis.* Cat. Maj. p. 553: Quid est itaque sacramentum altaris? Est verum corpus et sanguis Domini nostri Jesu Christi *in* et *sub* pane et vino per verbum Christi nobis christianis ad manducandum et bibendum institutum et mandatum. Form. Conc. p. 599: Credimus, quod in cœna Domini corpus et sanguis Christi vere et substantialiter sint præsentia, et quod una cum pane et vino vere distribuantur atque sumantur. Credimus, verba testamenti Christi non aliter accipienda esse, *quam sicut verba ipsa ad litteram sonant*, ita, ne panis absens Christi corpus et vinum absentem Christi sanguinem significent, sed ut propter sacramentalem unionem panis et vinum vere sint corpus et sanguis Christi. Comp. p. 736: Docent, quemadmodum in Christo duæ distinctæ et non mutatæ naturæ inseparabiliter sunt unitæ, ita in sacra cœna duas diversas substantias, panem videlicet naturalem et verum naturale corpus Christi, in instituta sacramenti administratione hic in terris simul esse præsentia. Further on its authors protest against the assertions of their opponents, p. 604: Prorsus rejicimus atque damnamus capernaiticam manducationem corporis Christi quam nobis Sacramentarii contra suæ conscientiæ testimonium post tot nostras protestationes malitiose affingunt, ut doctrinam nostram apud auditores suos in odium adducant, quasi videlicet doceamus, corpus Christi, dentibus laniari et instar alterius cujusdam cibi in corpore humano digeri.[1] Credimus autem et asserimus

[1] Luther had said that the body of Christ could not be treated like a sausage, for example (*Walch*, xx. s. 989); in like manner at the Marburg Colloquy, that we do not eat the body of Christ like "roasted pork"—which aroused *Zwingli's*

secundum clara verba testamenti Christi *veram*, sed *supernaturalem* manducationem corporis Christi, quemadmodum etiam vere, *supernaturaliter* tamen, sanguinem Christi bibi docemus. Hæc autem humanis sensibus aut ratione nemo comprehendere potest, quare in hoc negotio, sicut et in aliis fidei articulis, intellectum nostrum in obedientiam Christi captivare oportet. Hoc enim mysterium in solo Dei verbo revelatur et sola fide comprehenditur.

(11) See above, the extracts from *Zwingli* and the Reformed Confessions.

(12) *Prior* to the time of Calvin, *Martin Bucer*, *Oswald Myconius*, and others, spoke of the *spiritual participation* of Christ's body, which is present in heaven, an idea with which Zwingli was by no means unfamiliar, but which is less prominently brought forward in his writings than the negative side of the question (see note 5). Hence the Conf. Tetrapolitana (1530) admits "a true partaking of the true body and blood of Christ" in terms so definite, that it scarcely differs from the Conf. Augustana. In the first Confession of Basel (1534), in the composition of which Calvin had no share, it is also said: "But we firmly believe that *Christ Himself is the food of believing souls unto everlasting life*, and that our souls, by means of true faith in the crucified Redeemer, receive *the body and blood of Christ as their meat and drink*. . . . . Hence we confess that Christ, in His holy Supper, *is present* to all who really believe in Him."—On the other hand, it is also very significantly added: "But we do not include the natural, true, and essential body of Christ, which was born of the Virgin, suffered for us, and is ascended into heaven, in the bread and wine of the Lord," etc. And the second Confession of Basel (Helv. I.), A.D. 1536, Art. 22, concedes: Cœnam mysticam esse, in qua Dom. corpus et sanguinem suum, i. e. se ipsum, suis vere ad hoc offerat, ut magis magisque in illis vivat et illi in ipso: non quod pani et vino corpus Domini et sanguis vel naturaliter uniantur vel hic localiter includantur vel ulla huc carnali præsentia statuantur; sed quod panis et vinum ex institutione Domini symbola sint, quibus ab ipso Domino per ecclesiæ ministerium

indignation; see *Ebrard*, ii. s. 317: "*Many things are so sacred, that they may not be identified, nor even contrasted, with some others.*"

vera corporis et sanguinis ejus communicatio non in periturum ventris cibum, sed in æternæ vitæ alimoniam exhibeatur.—The *Lutheran* Church, moreover, does not exclude the idea of a *spiritual* reception of the body and blood of Christ; but this alone, it says, is not enough; comp. Form. Concord. 744. In particular, the Lutheran divines say that the sixth chapter of John's Gospel refers to the spiritualis manducatio, which, however, they distinguish from the sacramental (which is by the mouth).

(13) *Calvin* was in complete agreement with the earlier views on this point (much as he had at first taken offence at the prosaic interpretation of Zwingli,[1] designating it as a profana sententia), but also developed them more fully; comp. Instit. iv. 17. 10 (in *Henry*, i. s. 127 ff.). While *Zwingli* lays principal stress upon the historical fact, and the idea of a festival of commemoration, Calvin attaches greater importance to the inward union of the believer with Christ; and he emphasizes the bodily presence, not as being enclosed in the bread, but as communicated from above in a wonderful manner, by a spiritual act, viewing it as a pledge of the resurrection of our bodies,—an idea which Zwingli rejects. Thus, in his opinion, the Lord's Supper is not only an act to commemorate a past event, but also the pledge and seal of something that is present and future. As bread and wine sustain our earthly body, so are we nourished and quickened by a spiritual reception of the body and blood of Christ. But farther on it is said: Cogitemus primum *spirituale quiddam* esse sacramentum, quo Dom. non ventres nostros, sed animas pascere voluit. Ac Christum in eo quæramus, non nostro corpore, nec ut sensibus carnis nostræ comprehendi potest, sed sic, ut anima velut præsentem sibi datum et exhibitum agnoscat. Denique ipsum spiritualiter obtinere satis habemus. Compare with this his treatise, De Cœna (quoted by *Henry*, i. s. 261 ff.), and the Conf. Fidei de Eucharistia, quam obtulerunt Farellus, Calvinus, et Viretus, cui subscripserunt Bucerus et Capito, 1537 (quoted by *Henry*, i. Anh. Beil. 5). In the earlier part of this Conf., Calvin

[1] In a letter addressed to Viret (quoted by *Schlosser*, Peter Martyr, s. 451, note). On the question whether Calvin, as *Planck* supposes, held at first the opinion of *Luther*, but abandoned it afterwards, see *Bretschneider* in Ref.-Alman. iii. s. 81, and *Henry*, i. s. 262.

appears to express views allied to those of Luther: Vitam spiritualem, quam nobis Christus largitur, non in eo duntaxat sitam esse confitemur, quod spiritu suo nos vivificat, sed quod spiritus etiam sui virtute *carnis* suæ vivificæ nos facit participes, qua participatione in vitam æternam pascamur. Itaque cum de communione, quam cum Christo fideles habent, loquimur, *non minas carni et sanguini ejus communicare ipsos intelligimus quam spiritui, ut ita totum Christum possideant*, etc. On the other side, he pronounces, in terms equally strong, in favour of the symbolical interpretation: Cæterum istis nihil repugnat, quod Dominus noster in cœlum sublatus localem corporis sui præsentiam nobis abstulit, quæ hic minime exigitur. Nam utcunque nos in hac mortalitate peregrinantes in eodem loco cum ipso non includimur aut continemur, nullis tamen finibus limitata est ejus spiritus efficacia, quin vere copulare et in unum colligere possit, quæ locorum spatiis sunt disjuncta. Ergo spiritum ejus vinculum esse nostræ cum ipso participationis agnoscimus, sed ita, ut nos ille carnis et sanguinis Domini substantia vere ad immortalitatem pascat et eorum participatione vivificet. Hanc autem carnis et sanguinis sui communionem Christus *sub panis et vini symbolis* in sacrosancta sua cœna offert et exhibet omnibus, qui eam rite celebrant juxta legitimum ejus institutum.—*Bucer* and *Capito* indeed protested against the appellation *nuda et inania* symbola, as applied to the bread and wine, and denounced such usage as an error which the Church ought to reject; but had Zwingli ever made use of the expression "nuda et inania symbola"?—Thus *Calvin* (Instit. iv. 17. 32) also says: Fidem vero nos ista, quam enarravimus, corporis participatione non minus laute affluenterque pascimus, quam qui ipsum Christum e cœlo detrahunt. Ingenue interea confiteor, *mixturam* carnis Christi cum anima nostra vel *transfusionem*, qualis ab ipsis docetur, me repudiare, quia nobis sufficit, Christum e carnis suæ substantia vitam in animas nostras spirare, imo *propriam in nobis vitam diffundere*, quamvis in nos *non ingrediatur ipsa Christi caro*. Comp. also § 10: Nos vero talem Christi præsentiam in cœna statuere oportet, quæ *nec panis elemento ipsum affigat*, nec in panem includat, nec ullo modo circumscribat, etc. . . . Cæterum his absurditatibus sublatis, quicquid ad exprimendam veram sub-

stantialemque corporis ac sanguinis Domini communicationem, quæ sub sacris cœnæ symbolis fidelibus exhibetur, facere potest, libenter recipio: *atque ut non imaginatione duntaxat aut mentis intelligentia* percipere, sed ut *re ipsa* frui in alimentum vitæ æternæ intelligantur. Against the Hamburg preacher, *Westphal* (1552), Calvin defended himself in the most definite way from the charge of holding to a merely *spiritual* presence of Christ; but he also equally denied a *local* presence of Christ's body, and limited his statements to a dynamical. Defensio II. p. 68–72: Ita Christum corpore absentem doceo nihilominus non tantum divina sua virtute, quæ ubique diffusa est, nobis adesse, sed etiam facere, ut nobis vivifica sit sua caro. . . . Reclamat hic Westphalus, me *spiritus præsentiam* opponere *carnis præsentiæ;* sed quatenus id faciam, ex eodem loco clare patere malevolentia excæcatus non inspicit. Neque enim simpliciter *spiritu suo* Christus in nobis habitare trado, sed ita nos ad se attollere, ut *vivificum carnis suæ vigorem in nos transfundat.*

Slightly as Zwingli and Calvin differed respecting the Lord's Supper, the divines at Zürich at first looked with some mistrust upon the theory of the latter (*Lavater*, Histor. Sacram. p. 98). But the *Agreement* between the churches of Zürich and Geneva was set forth in the Consensus Tigurinus, where it is said distinctly, No. 21: Tollenda est quælibet localis præsentiæ imaginatio. Nam quum signa hic in mundo sint, oculis cernantur, palpentur manibus: Christus, quatenus homo est, non alibi quam in cœlo, nec aliter quam mente et fidei intelligentia quærendus est. Quare *perversa et impia superstitio est, ipsum sub elementis hujus mundi includere.* 22: Proinde, qui in solennibus cœnæ verbis; Hoc est corp. m. etc., præcise literalem, ut loquuntur, sensum urgent, eos tamquam præposteros interpretes repudiamus. Nam extra controversiam ponimus, figurate accipiendia esse, ut esse panis et vinum dicantur id quod significant.—Comp. also Conf. Gall., Art. 36; Helv. II. c. 21 (comparison with the sun); Belgica 35; Anglica 28, 29; Scot. 21. In some Calvinistic symbols the positive element is prominently brought forward, but something is always added in order to prevent any close approach to the Lutheran view. Thus it is said in the Catechism of Heidelberg, Qu. 76: "What do you understand by eating the

crucified body of Christ, and drinking the blood which He shed? *Ans.* By this we understand, not only that we accept with a believing heart the whole sufferings and death of Christ, and thereby receive forgiveness of sins and eternal life, but also therewith (daneben), by the influence of the Holy Ghost, who dwells at the same time in Christ and in ourselves, that we are so intimately united to His blessed body, that although *He be in heaven and we on earth,* we are flesh of His flesh and bone of His bone, and eternally live, and are governed by one spirit (as the members of our body are governed by one soul)."—Confess. Sigism. c. 8: . . . "Therefore we simply abide by the words pronounced by Christ at the institution of this ordinance, that the bread is His true body, and the wine His holy blood, sacramentally, in the manner in which God ordained and instituted the holy sacraments of both the Old and the New Test., that they should be visible and true signs of the invisible grace communicated by them; and in the manner in which our Lord Himself signifies, that *the holy Eucharist is a sign of the New Testament* (covenant), *but not a mere sign, nor an empty one,* and instituted for the commemoration of Christ's death . . . that thus it *might be a memorial of consolation, a memorial of gratitude, and a memorial of love.*" 9: "And inasmuch as faith is, as it were, the mouth by which we receive the crucified body of Christ, and His blood shed for us, His Electoral Grace holds with stedfastness that this sacrament does not help *unbelievers,* or *those who do not repent,* and that they do not participate *in the true body and blood of Christ.*" For further passages, see *Winer,* s. 138 ff. *Schenkel,* i. s. 561 ff. *Ebrard,* ii. s. 402 ff. The idea of an elevation of the soul to heaven is from *Lasco;* see *Ebrard,* ii. s. 535.

(14) Formula Concordiæ, vii. p. 732: Non propter alicuius aut personam aut incredulitatem verbum Dei (quo Cœna Domini instituta est et propter quod rationem Sacramenti habet) irritum et vanum fieri potest. Quia Christus non dixit: Si credideritis aut digni fueritis, tum in Cœna sacra corpus et sanguinem meum præsentia habebitis, sed potius ait: Accipite, edite et bibite, hoc est corpus meum, etc. . . . Verba Christi hoc volunt: Sive dignus sive indignus sis, habes hic in Cœna Christi corpus et sanguinem. Comp. 743: Quod

autem non tantum pii et credentes in Christum, verum etiam indigni, impii, hypocritæ (v. g. Judas), et hujus farinæ homines . . . etiam verum corpus et verum sanguinem Christi ore in Sacramento sumant, et grande scelus indigne edendo et bibendo in corpus et sanguinem Christi admittant, id D. Paulus expresse docet, etc.

(15) By doing violence to the rules of grammar (by inverting the order of subject and predicate), *Schwenkfeld* and *Krautwald* made out this sense: My body, which is given for you, is the very thing which I distribute among you, namely bread, a real food, and the efficacious means of preserving eternal life. As analogous instances they adduced: the seed *is* the word of God; the field *is* the world; the rock *was* Christ. See Das Buch vom Christenmenschen (Werke, Bd. i. s. 898); *Schenkel*, i. s. 556 ff. *Planck*, v. 1, s. 90. *Schwenkfeld* also insisted upon the mystical aspect of the Lord's Supper: "From the fountain of God's love and sweetness, we eat the body of Christ and drink His blood, to strengthen the conscience, refresh the heart, and for the increase of the inner man in all the spiritual riches of God." . . . "The bread of eternal life must be well masticated (*i.e.* thoroughly contemplated) by all who eat it. They eat it, and have eaten thereof, who have grasped this act of the New Testament and of our salvation in true faith, and who know that they are not only redeemed by this same body of Christ which was broken for us, but that it also has other food and nourishment, and power to everlasting life." (Werke, i. s. 911, in *Schenkel*, l.c.) Comp. *Erbkam's* Protest. Secten im Zeitalter der Reform. s. 468 ff.

(16) Cat. Rac., Qu. 334: (Cœna Domini) est Christi institutum, ut fideles ipsius panem frangant et comedant et ex calice bibant, mortis ipsius annunciandæ causa. Quod permanere in adventum ipsius oportet. Ib. Qu. 335: (Annunciare mortem Domini) est publice et sacrosancte Christo gratias agere, quod is pro ineffabili sua erga nos caritate corpus suum torqueri et quodammo frangi et sanguinem suum fundi passus sit, et hoc ipsius beneficium laudibus tollere et celebrare. Ib. Qu. 337: Nonne alia causa, ob quam cœnam instituit Dom., superest? Nulla prorsus, etsi homines multas excogitarint, cum alii dicant esse sacrificium pro vivis et mortuis, alii usu

ipsius se consequi peccatorum remissionem et firmare fidem sperant, et quod eis mortem Domini in mentem revocet, affirmant. Comp. *Socinus*, De Cœna Domini, p. 753*b*, where the boasted effects of the sacrament are ascribed to the *word*, with which the ceremony is only externally connected.— *Ostorodt*, Underrichtung, says, p. 230, that the Lord's Supper is only a ceremony, and is called a sacrament without any reason; see *Fock's* Socinianismus, s. 573 ff. The Socinians regarded the controversy between the Lutherans and Calvinists as mere logomachy, and sharply criticized their entire forgetfulness of Christian love in strife about such a matter. They avowed their agreement with Zwingli. See *Fock*, s. 577.— Concerning the views of the Arminians, see Confess. Remonstrant. 23. 4, and *Limborch*, Theol. Christ. v. 71. 9 ss. (where he combats the doctrine of the Lord's Supper as held by the orthodox Reformed). The opinions of the Mennonites on this point will be found in *Ris*, Conf., Art. 34 (*Winer*, s. 135).

(17) Comp. § 258, note 7.

(18) [Westminster Confession, chap. xxix. 5: The outward elements in this sacrament, duly set apart to the uses ordained by Christ, have such relation to Him crucified, as that truly, yet sacramentally only, they are sometimes called by the name of the things they represent, to wit, the body and blood of Christ; albeit, in substance and nature, they still remain truly, and only, bread and wine, as they were before. 7. Worthy receivers, outwardly partaking of the visible elements in this sacrament, do then also inwardly by faith, really and indeed, yet not carnally and corporally, but spiritually, receive and feed upon Christ crucified, and all benefits of His death: the body and blood of Christ being then not corporally nor carnally in, with, or under the bread and wine; yet as really, but spiritually, present to the faith of believers in that ordinance, as the elements themselves are to their outward senses. 8. Although ignorant and wicked men receive the outward elements in this sacrament, yet they receive not the thing signified thereby; but by their unworthy coming thereunto are guilty of the body and blood of the Lord to their own damnation.]

(19) [Article 28 of 39 Articles. *Of the Lord's Supper.* The Supper of the Lord is not only a sign of the love that Christians ought to have among themselves one to another,

but rather is a Sacrament of our Redemption by Christ's death: insomuch that to such as rightly, worthily, and with faith, receive the same, the Bread which we break is a partaking of the Body of Christ; and likewise the Cup of Blessing is a partaking of the Blood of Christ.—Transubstantiation (or the change of the substance of Bread and Wine) in the Supper of the Lord cannot be proved by Holy Writ; but is repugnant to the plain words of Scripture, overthroweth the nature of a Sacrament, and hath given occasion to many superstitions.—The Body of Christ is given, taken, and eaten, in the Supper, only after an heavenly and spiritual manner. And the mean whereby the Body of Christ is received and eaten in the Supper is Faith.—The Sacrament of the Lord's Supper was not by Christ's ordinance reserved, carried about, lifted up, or worshipped.—Article 29. *Of the Wicked which eat not the Body of Christ in the use of the Lord's Supper.* The Wicked, and such as be void of a lively faith, although they do carnally and visibly press with their teeth (as St. *Augustine* saith) the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ, yet in no wise are they partakers of Christ: but rather, to their condemnation, do eat and drink the sign or Sacrament of so great a thing. (The words attributed to St. Augustine are not found in any of the known MSS. of Augustine.) See *Porson's* Letters.—Article 31. *Of the One Oblation of Christ finished upon the Cross.* The Offering of Christ once made is that perfect redemption, propitiation, and satisfaction for all the sins of the whole world, both original and actual; and there is none other satisfaction for sin, but that alone. Wherefore the sacrifices of Masses, in the which it was commonly said that the Priest did offer Christ for the quick and the dead, to have remission of pain or guilt, were blasphemous fables and dangerous deceits.—(On the general subject of the position of the English Church in respect to the doctrine, see Tracts for the Times, No. 81: The testimony of writers of the later English Church to the Doctrines of the Eucharistic Sacrifice, with an Historical Account of the Changes made in the Liturgy as the expression of that Doctrine.)]

With the doctrinal differences of the various denominations are closely connected their liturgical peculiarities. The most essential difference is this, that the Roman Catholic Church persisted in withholding the cup from the laity,

while all other parties, inclusive of the Greek Church, demanded that it should be restored to them. (See note 3.) On the usage respecting the host (in the Roman Catholic and Lutheran Churches, partly also in the Reformed Church), and as to the bread (in the Greek and Reformed Churches); on the breaking of the bread in the Reformed Church, and the reception with the hand instead of the mouth; on the elevation of the host; on the manner in which the congregation receive the sacrament (whether they go to the table or remain in their seats); on the modes and formulas of distribution; on private communion, auricular or general confession, etc., comp. the works on archæology and those on the liturgies. *Ebrard*, Abendmahl, ii. s. 794–796.—The strict Lutherans opposed the breaking of the bread, for the following among other reasons, in the Consensus Repetitus Fidei Veræ Luth., Punct. 72 (in *Henke*, p. 56): Profitemur et docemus, panis fractionem et vini effusionem in ora fidelium non fuisse factam a Christo ob repræsentationem mortis dominicæ, sed ob distributionem inter communicantes, adeoque ἀρτοκλασίαν non fuisse formalem seu essentialem ritum hujus sacramenti, sed tantum ministerialem, qui faceret ad meliorem distributionem.—It was a fundamental principle of Protestantism, that the participation in the Lord's Supper should be a *communion* shared in common: *Luther* also at first adopted this view (see his Letters, ed. *De Wette*, iv. 160), and sanctioned even the communion of the sick only conditionally (ibid. v. s. 227). Differences of usages were introduced into the Lutheran and Reformed Churches only at a later period. —Finally, the peculiarity of the Roman Catholic view is shown in this, that, altogether apart from reception, the presence of the body of Christ in the host is the continuous object of worship. While, according to the [Roman] Catholic doctrine, the other sacraments have their sanctifying power through their being *used*, in this case the all-sanctifying Godhead is present *before* the sacrament is used. The climax of this adoration of the body of Christ, present in the host, is reached in the festival of Corpus Christi.

§ 260.

Internal Fluctuations and further Doctrinal Development.

Although the existing differences of opinion rendered impossible an immediate union between the various sections of the Protestant Church, there were not wanting those who, on the one hand, may be styled Crypto-Calvinists (1), and on the other Crypto-Lutherans (2). But the existence of these parties gave rise to increased efforts on the part of the orthodox of both Churches, to establish a more precise definition of their distinguishing doctrines, and to secure them against corruption and misinterpretation. The schoolmen made a threefold distinction in the Lord's Supper: *matter*, *form*, and

end (or *object*), which were again subdivided according to various categories (3). The mystics, abiding by the mysterious import of the doctrine, took no part in the ecclesiastical controversies (4); some of them even showed that each of the principal sections of the Church rests on a religious idea, the living appropriation of which is, in their opinion, the principal thing in this ordinance, whatever meaning may be attached to it (5). Among Roman Catholic writers, *Bossuet* endeavoured to defend, on philosophical grounds, the doctrine of transubstantiation and of the sacrifice of the mass (6), while the *Jansenists* and Roman Catholic Mystics rigidly retained the doctrine of the Church. But they directed their devout consideration not so much to a dialectical defence of the stiff notion, as to the mysterious effects which the sacrament produces upon the inward man (7).

(1) Compare above, § 215, note 7; *Ebrard*, s. 686 ff.

(2) *Marbach* of Strassburg, and *Simon Sulzer* of Basel. The latter was opposed by *H. Erzberger*. Comp. *Hagenbach*, Geschichte der Basler Conf. s. 87 ff. The very remarkable confessions of Sulzer and Erzberger are there given, Appendix C, s. 232, and Appendix C, s. 218 ff. Comp. *Hundeshagen*, Conflicte, s. 147 ff.; *Ebrard*, ii. s. 484 ff.

(3) The matter is (*a*) terrestris (the elements bread and wine); (*b*) cœlestis, which is subdivided into *α*, corpus et sanguis Christi; *β*, gratia divina. 2. The *form* is (*a*) interna (unio sacramentalis); (*b*) externa, which is composed of *α*, consecratio; *β*, distributio; *γ*, sumptio. 3. *Finis* (fructus) est collatio et obsignatio gratiæ divinæ. This end is subdivided into (*a*) finis ultimus (salus æterna); (*b*) intermedius, *α*, recordatio et commemoratio mortis Christi, quæ fide peragitur; *β*, obsignatio promissionis de remissione peccatorum et fidei confirmatio; *γ*, insitio nostra in Christum et spiritualis nutritio ad vitam; *δ*, dilectio mutua communicantium. See *Hase*, Hutterus Redivivus, p. 314, 315. Among the Calvinistic theologians, see *Heidegger*, Loci xxv. c. 13 ss.

(4) Thus *Phil. Paracelsus*, Sagac. Lib. i. c. 5, § 10, comp. ii. 2 (qu. by *Preu*, Theol. des Paracelsus, s. 1); he there speaks

rather of an internal (mystical) communion, than of a real participation of the elements. "The regenerate must be nourished by Christ, and not only obtain the art and wisdom of nature, as we gather pears from the trees, but receive wisdom from Him who has sent it. Respecting Christ, it is said, we must eat His flesh and drink His blood, that is, we must be born of Him; He is the first-born, but we fill up the number." (Comp. *Schwenkfeld*, above.)

(5) Thus *Poiret* in his treatise, Gewissensruhe. See *Hagenbach*, Vorlesungen, Bd. iv. s. 326.

(6) Exposition de la Doctrine Catholique, c. 10 ss. In his opinion, there is no medium between the view of unbelievers who reject everything, and the orthodox doctrine of the Church. Every other view is inconsistent with itself; God has suffered the Protestants to fall into such inconsistencies, in order to facilitate their return to the Catholic Church. The figurative interpretation, however, may be admitted in a certain sense (as involved in the real), p. 140: "For the rest, the truth which the Eucharist contains in its internal aspect does not prevent its being considered a sign in as far as it is external and tangible; but it is a sign of such a nature that, so far from excluding the reality, it necessarily carries it along with it."

(7) On Jansenism, comp. § 228, note 3. On the controversy respecting the Lord's Supper, between *Pierre Nicole* and *Anton Arnauld* on the one side, and *Claude*, a Calvinistic minister, on the other, see *Schröckh*, vii. s. 367. Among the mystics similar opinions obtained to those of the preceding period. Thus *François de Sales* said, Introd. ii. 14: Hoc (sacramentum) religionis christianæ centrum est, devotionis cor, pietatis anima, mysterium ineffabile, quodque divinæ charitatis abyssum in se comprehendit, ac per quod se Deus ipse realiter nobis applicans gratias et dona sua nobis magnifice communicat.—Comp. *Bonæ* Tract. Ascet. de Sacrificio Missæ (Opp. p. 177 ss.). *Fénélon*, Œuvres Spirit. i. p. 414.

As regards the other (Roman Catholic) sacraments (respecting Baptism, see § 270), their fundamental principles must be considered by Protestant theologians in other parts of their works on systematic theology; thus *Penance* is treated of in connection with the economy of salvation, though some of the earlier Lutheran divines placed it after the chapters on Baptism and

the Lord's Supper (*e.g. Hollaz*, p. 1141); the sacrament of *Holy Orders*, in connection with the doctrine concerning the Church; that of *Matrimony* forms a part of ethics and the Canon Law, though some, *e.g. Gerhard*, still assigned to it a place in doctrinal theology (Loci Theol. tom. xv.); and lastly, the sacraments of *Confirmation* (which has nothing in common with the Protestant rite of the same name) and of *Extreme Unction* are only considered in a negative aspect, viz. as sacramenta spuria, see *Heidegger*, Loci xxv. c. 23 ss.

As regards *Penance*, the Roman Catholic Church retained the scholastic division into contritio (different from attritio) cordis, confessio oris, and satisfactio operis, while the only distinction made by Protestants was that between contritio and fides. Comp. Concil. Trid., Sess. 14, c. 3; and in defence of the Protestant view, Conf. Aug., Art. 12: Constat autem pœnitentia proprie his duabus partibus: Altera est contritio, seu terrores incussi conscientiæ agnito peccato. Altera est fides, quæ concipitur ex evangelio seu absolutione et credit propter Christum remitti peccata, et consolatur conscientiam, et ex terroribus liberat. *Deinde sequi debent opera bona, quæ sunt fructus pœnitentiæ.* Art. Smalcald, p. 321, and the other passages quoted by *Winer*, s. 150. Respecting *Confession*, the two great sections of the Protestant Church differed in this, that the earlier Lutherans attached importance to private confession, while the Reformed were satisfied (as a general rule) with public confession. But neither of them demanded, like the Roman Catholics, a special enumeration of all sins, in consequence of which both rejected auricular confession. *Luther* especially, in his treatise De Captiv. Babyl., and in the Articles of Schmalkalden, expressed himself in strong terms against this *confessio carnificina*. Art. Smalcald, p. 323: Confessio sic instituabatur, ut homines juberentur omnia sua peccata enumerare (quod factu impossibile est) hæc ingens carnificina fuit. Et si quis quorundam peccatorum oblitus esset, is eatenus absolvebatur, ut si in memoriam illa recurrerent, ea postea confiteretur, etc. As to the relation between the confessor and the person who confesses, the Roman Catholics, on account of their different views of the priesthood, entertained different opinions from the Protestants; see *Winer*, l.c., and the passages quoted by him and *J. H. Jordan*, Einige Capitel über die Beichte, Ansbach 1847. Here, too, *Zwingli* advances still farther, and objects to Luther, that in respect to absolution he still holds the old doctrine ("That the words of Christ," etc. *Werke*, ii. 2, s. 22). As regards the *satisfactio*, Protestants from the first not only rejected pilgrimages and similar observances, but also looked on prayers, fastings, and alms in a very different light. Concerning *Fasting*, see *Winer*, s. 155. The nova obedientia, which some Protestants would have substituted for the satisfactio operis, is, properly speaking, the same with fides (the second part of penance): nevertheless it is said in the Apol. Conf. p. 165: Si quis volet addere tertiam (partem), videlicet dignos fructus pœnitentiæ, h. e. mutationem totius vitæ ac morum in melius, non refragabimur.—The Protestant theologians further distinguished between, 1. Pœnitentia prima (magna); 2. Continuata (quotidiana); 3. Iterata (lapsorum); 4. Sera (quæ fit ultimis vitæ momentis). The question whether the last kind was admissible or not, gave rise to a controversy with the Pietists (the so-called lis terministica). Comp. *Hase*, Hutterus Redivivus, p. 294.—Concerning *Indulgences* in the Roman Catholic Church, and the various modifications of the theory of Indulgences (occasioned by the opposition of the Reformers), see *Winer*, s. 159.—Respecting the other sacraments (Confir-

mation, Matrimony, Extreme Unction, Holy Orders), see ibid. s. 160 ff. The difference of opinion among Protestants and Roman Catholics, as to the validity and dissolubility of Matrimony (divortium), prohibited degrees of relationship, the marriage of the clergy, the vow of chastity (monasticism), resulted from differences in fundamental principles. (For the respective passages, see *Winer*, l.c.) Comp. *Klee*, Dogmengeschichte, Bd. ii. *Hase*, Polemik, s. 118 ff.

§ 261.

The Doctrine of Purgatory.

In connection with the doctrine of the mass and its effects (1), stands the Roman Catholic doctrine of *purgatorial* fire into which the souls of all those pious persons are removed who die without having made full satisfaction for their sins, and out of which they may be delivered by means of private masses and indulgences (2). The Protestants unanimously rejected this antiscriptural doctrine (3), and also the Greek theologians, though the latter admitted the notion of an intermediate state of the departed (4). [The leading divines of the Anglican Church held to the doctrine of the intermediate state, while rejecting purgatory (5).]

(1) Conc. Trid., Sess. 22, cap. 2: Non solum pro fidelium vivorum peccatis, pœnis, satisfactionibus, et aliis necessitatibus, sed et pro defunctis et in Christo nondum ad plenum purgatis, rite juxta Apostolorum traditionem, offertur. Comp. c. 9, Can. 3: Si quis dixerit, Missæ sacrificium . . . non pro defunctis offerri debere: anathema sit.

(2) Ibid, Sess. 6, Can. 30, but especially Sess. 25; Cat. Rom. i. 6, 3: Est purgatorius ignis, quo piorum animæ ad definitum tempus cruciatæ expiantur, ut eis in æternam patriam ingressus patere possit, in quam nihil coinquinatum ingreditur. Ac de hujus quidem doctrinæ veritate, quum et scripturarum testimoniis et apostolica traditione confirmatum esse sancta concilia declarant, eo diligentius et sæpius parocho disserendum erit, quod in ea tempora incidimus, quibus homines sanam doctrinam non sustinent. Comp. *Bellarmine*, De Amiss. Grat. et Statu Peccati, i. c. 14, p. 116; De Justific. v. 4, p. 1084.

Bossuet (Exposit. 8. p. 72) made but slight mention of purgatory, and bestowed praise upon the Council of Trent on account of the great caution (*grande retenue*) which it observed in reference to it.

(3) Art. Smalc. p. 307: Purgatorium et quidquid ei solennitatis, cultus, et quæstus adhæret, mera diaboli larva est. Pugnat enim cum primo articulo, qui docet, Christum solum et non hominum opera animas liberare.—*Zwingli* taught that after death there is an immediate entrance into the heavenly mansions; Fidei Expositio (Opera, iv. p. 65): Credimus animas fidelium protinus ut ex corporibus evaserint, subvolare in cœlum, numini conjungi, æternumque gaudere; comp. p. 50 (De Purgatorio). Comp. his exposition of the 57th Article (Deutsche Schriften, i. s. 408): "Consequently Purgatory, of which the theologians speak, is opposed to the power of faith; for he who believes is already in a state of safety, and is exposed to no sentence of condemnation. On the other hand, he who does not believe is not safe; and it is impossible that (without faith) he should be in a state of felicity or of acceptance with God (Heb. xi. 6). Understand the matter, then, in this way: If a man dies in faith, he is safe; if he dies in unbelief, he is condemned. *Between these nothing can come.*"—Conf. Helv. II. c. 26: Quod quidam tradunt de igne purgatorio, fidei christianæ, "Credo remissionem peccatorum et vitam æternam," purgationique plenæ per Christum et Christi sententiis adversatur. Conf. Gall. 24: Purgatorium arbitramur figmentum esse ex eadem officina profectum, unde etiam manarunt vita monastica, peregrinationes, interdicta matrimonii et usus ciborum, ceremonialis certorum dierum observatio, confessio auricularis, indulgentiæ, ceteræque res omnes ejusmodi, quibus opinantur quidam, se gratiam et salutem mereri.

(4) Conf. Orth. p. 112: *Πῶς πρέπει νὰ γροικοῦμεν διὰ τὸ πῦρ τὸ καθαρτήριον; οὐδεμία γραφὴ διαλαμβάνει περὶ αὐτοῦ· νὰ εὑρίσκεται δηλαδὴ κἂν μία πρόσκαιρος κόλασις καθαρτικὴ τῶν ψυχῶν, ὕστερα ἀπὸ τὸν θάνατον.* For further particulars, see *Winer*, s. 157 f.

(5) [Art. 22 declares: The Romish doctrine concerning Purgatory, Pardons, Worshipping and Adoration, as well of Images as of Reliques, and also Invocation of Saints, is a fond

thing vainly invented, and grounded upon no warranty of Scripture, but rather repugnant to the word of God. *T. Burnet*, De Statu mortuorum; and in answer to him, *T. Burnet*, LL.D., De Paradiso, etc., 1767, 4to. Archbishop *Usher*, On Prayers for the Dead, reprinted in Tracts for the Times, No. 72.—On Purgatory, in Tracts for the Times, No. 79.]

SECOND CLASS.

DOCTRINES IN WHICH PROTESTANTS AND ROMAN CATHOLICS MORE OR LESS AGREED.

(IN OPPOSITION TO THE MINOR SECTS.)

FIRST DIVISION.

THEOLOGY PROPER.

§ 262.

Trinitarians and Antitrinitarians.

HOWEVER much Protestants differed from Roman Catholics in their general system of faith, they were in perfect accordance in their Confession of the *Triune God*, resting on the decisions of the ancient œcumenical definitions of doctrine (1). The views of the earlier *Unitarians*, as well as of the later *Socinians*, were directly at variance with this Trinitarian doctrine of the three persons and one substance in God; and it is worthy of observation that they revised the various Antitrinitarian views of earlier times. *Michael Servetus* adopted the position of Sabellius, but with this difference, that (after the example of Photinus) he made a distinction between the *Son of God* who appeared in time, and the eternal *Logos* (Word) (2). Others, again, bordered upon Arianism (3). *Faustus Socinus* returned to the (abstract) Unitarianism of the Nazarenes, or the Alogi, who, acknowledging only the

Father as God, saw in Christ only a man endowed with extraordinary gifts, and afterwards raised to heaven, and in the Holy Ghost a divine energy (4). The *Arminians* adhered on the whole to the orthodox doctrine, but with intimations as to the subordination of both the Son and the Spirit (5) to the Father, which brought upon them the suspicion of a tendency to Socinianism. [In England the subordination scheme was vindicated by *Bishop Bull*, on the basis of the consent of the early Fathers; the Arian system was revived by *Samuel Clarke;* and a tendency to Tritheism was imputed to *William Sherlock*, by *Wallis* and *South*, who, in turn, were charged with Sabellianism (6).]

(1) Suspicions were not wanting that the Reformers themselves countenanced Antitrinitarian errors. Thus *Calvin* was at one time charged with Arianism by *Caroli;* see *Henry*, Leben Joh. Calvins, i. s. 181. It is certainly remarkable that the terms *Trinity* and *person* were avoided in the Confession of Geneva (*Henry*, s. 182). *Melanchthon*, too, in the first edition of his Loci, pronounced the scholastic definitions respecting the nature of the Trinity foreign to Christian theology.[1] And *Luther* frankly confessed (Ueber die letzten Worte Davids, Wittenberg edit. Bd. v. s. 551): "It is not to be wondered at, that when a man reads this mysterious, incomprehensible article, strange thoughts should occur to him, of which one or another is sometimes little appropriate, and gives rise to dangerous expressions. Yet, the foundation of our faith remaining unshaken, such splinters, chips, and straws will do us no harm. But the basis of the faith is . . . our belief that there are three persons in the one Godhead, and each person is the same one, perfect God; so that the three persons are not confounded, nor the divine substance divided, but the distinction of persons and unity of nature go together. This is the great mystery, which angels will never cease to contemplate and to admire, and the beholding of which constitutes their blessedness. If they could ever

[1] This is otherwise in the later editions: the doctrine is most fully unfolded by Melanchthon in the third edition of his Loci (Corp. Reform. xxi. p. 614), but without any proper speculative support.

see the end of it, there would also be an end of their blessedness."[1] *Calvin* expresses himself in a more speculative way, *e.g.* in his Institutes, i. 13, and elsewhere (against Servetus). His exposition of the Trinity, says *Gass* (s. 105), "*is undoubtedly the best, and the most careful, which can be found in the writings of the Reformers.*" The definitions of the schools, however, were not introduced into the Church Confessions of the Protestants. The Lutherans simply appealed to the Nicene and Athanasian Creeds, which, together with the Apostles' Creed, were prefixed to the Liber Concordiæ. Among the symbolical books of the Reformed Church, the First Confession of Basel designates the first article (that concerning the Trinity) as a symbolum commune: der gemein Gloub. In several of the Confessions, the erroneous innovations of the times were rejected. Thus, in the Conf. Aug., Art. 1: .... Nomine Personæ utuntur ea significatione, qua usi sunt in hac causa scriptores ecclesiastici, ut significet non partem aut qualitatem in alio, sed quod proprie subsistit. Damnant omnes hæreses. . . . Samosatenos veteres et neotericos, qui cum tantum unam personam esse contendant, de Verbo et de Spiritu Sancto *astute et impie rhetoricantur*, quod non sint personæ distinctæ, sed quod Verbum significet verbum vocale et Spiritus motum in rebus creatum. —In the Apol. it is said: Primum articulum Confessionis nostræ *probant* nostri adversarii. . . . Hunc articulum semper docuimus et defendimus, et sentimus eum habere certa et firma testimonia in Scripturis Sanctis, quæ labefactari non queunt.—Comp. Conf. Helvet. II. Art. 3, where, in proof of this doctrine, the following passages are quoted from Scripture: Luke i. 35; Matt. iii. 16, 17; John i. 32; Matt. xviii. 19; John xiv. 26, xv. 26.[2] Comp. Conf. Gall. 6; Belg. 8 and 9; Angl. 1 and 2; Scotica 1. On the doctrine of the Trinity as propounded in the Catech. of Heidelberg (*God* the Father,

[1] There are also in Luther hints about a speculative treatment of the doctrine (see *Heppe*, s. 285; *Dieckhoff*, l.c. § 214); but they have the air of reminiscences from the earlier scholastic mysticism.

[2] It is remarkable that the well-known passage, 1 John v. 7, is nowhere quoted; *Luther* also omitted it in his translation.—In the first Confession of Basel no scriptural proofs were adduced, but in a marginal note it was observed: "This is proved from the whole Scripture of the Old and New Testaments by many passages.

God the Son, and *God* the Holy Ghost), see *Beckhaus* in Illgen, l.c. s. 52.

(2) De Trinitatis Erroribus in seven books, extracts from which are given in *Trechsel*, Antitrinitar. s. 67–98. *Servetus*, instead of commencing his deduction with the Logos, *i.e.* in a speculative manner, adopted the analytico-historical mode of procedure. He begins with the person of Christ[1] in its human manifestation: this is the *Son* of God. Orthodox theologians, he says, incorrectly represent the (Johannean) *Word* as the Son, and thus deny that the man is the Son of God.—He expressed himself in decided terms against the separation of two natures. In his opinion, Christ is man filled with the Godhead, and wholly penetrated by the divine nature: He denied that God is man, not that Christ is God. —He regarded the Spirit of God as the power and breath of God in creation, and a moral principle working in man; in reference to the latter point he is called *Holy* Spirit. But Servetus endeavoured in every way to ridicule the ecclesiastical (post-Nicene) doctrine of the Trinity; he only admitted a Sabellian Trinity: Quia tres sunt admirandæ Dei dispositiones, in quarum qualibet divinitas relucet, ex quo sanissime trinitatem intelligere posses: nam Pater est tota substantia et unus Deus, ex quo gradus isti et personatus descendunt. Et tres sunt, non aliqua rerum in Deo distinctione, sed per Dei οἰκονομίαν variis Deitatis formis; nam eadem divinitas, quæ est in Patre, communicatur filio Jesu Christo et spiritui nostro, qui est templum Dei viventis; sunt enim filius et sanctificatus spiritus noster consortes substantiæ Patris, membra, pignora, et instrumenta, licet varia sit in iis deitatis species; et hoc est, quod distinctæ personæ dicuntur, i. e. multiformes deitatis aspectus, diversæ facies et species. According to the exegesis of Servetus, the expression *Logos*, in the writings of John, does not denote a person, but, according to its etymology, signifies oraculum, vox, sermo, eloquium Dei. Thus he returned to the ancient distinction between λόγος ἐνδιάθετος and προφορικός (f. 48, quoted by *Trechsel*, s. 79): Verbum in Deo proferente est ipsemet Deus loquens. Post prolationem est ipsa caro; seu Verbum Dei,

[1] Hence we must here anticipate somewhat, treating of christology in connection with theology.

antequam caro illa fieret, intelligebatur ipsum Dei oraculum inter nubis caliginem nondum manifestatum (the hidden God), quia Deus erat ille sermo. Et postquam Verbum homo factum est, per Verbum intelligimus ipsum Christum, qui est Verbum Dei et vox Dei; nam quasi vox est ex ore Dei prolatus. Propterea dicitur ipse Sermo Patris, quia Patris mentem enunciat et ejus cognitionem facit. In his opinion there was no interval between the (hypostatical) generation of the Son and the birth of Christ. The prolatio verbi and the generatio carnis are *one* and *the same* act. He also rejected what were commonly called the opera ad intra. Comp. *Heberle,* Michael Servets Trinitätslehre und Christologie (in the Tübing. Theol. Zeitschrift, 1840, 2). The chief refutation of Servetus was by *Calvin,* in his Defensio orthod. Fidei adversus prodigiosos Errores Serveti. *Stähelin,* Leben Calvins, s. 422 ff.

(3) This was the case, *e.g.*, with *William Campanus,* who, though refusing to admit the Arian phrase, *ἦν ποτὲ ὅτε οὐκ ἦν,* nevertheless strongly asserted the subordination of the Son to the Father, and termed him "the steward and servant, the messenger and ambassador of God." But it was the Divinity of the Holy Spirit which was especially impugned by Campanus: "Nothing in the world can be more futile, and *against* nothing can more powerful arguments be adduced from Scripture." Accordingly, he supposed the existence of *two* divine persons alone, the Father and the Son; as matrimony too admits only two persons, and excludes every third. See *Trechsel,* s. 32 (after *Schelhorn,* Dissert. de Joh. Campano Antitrinitario, in his Amœnitatt. Litt. t. xi. p. 32 ss.). *Adam Pastoris* (Rudolph Martini) also appears to have propounded Arian rather than Sabellian views; see *Trechsel,* s. 32.

(4) *F. Socinus* agreed with Servetus in rejecting the idea of persons in the divine nature, but he considered Christ as *ψιλὸς ἄνθρωπος,* not, like Servetus, as a man filled and penetrated with the divine nature, or, as it were, God appearing in the world, manifesting Himself in the flesh. He differed from the Ebionites only in this, that he (like the Nazarenes) supposed the birth of Christ to be supernatural. He substituted a man who became, as it were, God, for God becoming man; for he ascribed a kind of divine worship to that Christ who, *after*

His resurrection, was elevated to heaven (a species of worship resembling that which Roman Catholics render to the saints, though in a still higher measure). Comp. Cat. Racov. p. 32: Vox *Deus* duobus potissimum modis in Scripturis usurpatur: prior est, cum designat illum, qui in cœlis et in terra omnibus ita dominatur et præest, ut neminem superiorem agnoscat, atque in hac significatione Scriptura unum esse Deum asserit; posterior modus est, cum eum denotat, qui potestatem aliquam sublimem ab uno illo Deo habet aut deitatis unius illius Dei *aliqua ratione* particeps est. Etenim in Scripturis propterea Deus ille unus Deus deorum vocatur (Ps. l. 1). Et hac quidem posteriore ratione filius Dei vocatur Deus in quibusdam Scripturæ locis. That Christ was *ex essentia patris genitus*, is most strongly denied in the Catech. Racov., see p. 56. Other passages are quoted by *Winer*, s. 42. (Compare below on Christology.)—Concerning the Holy Spirit, *Socinus* said, in his Breviss. Instit. p. 652: Quid de Spir. S. dicis? Nempe illum non esse personam aliquam a Deo, cujus est spiritus, distinctam, sed tantummodo (ut nomen ipsum Spiritus, quod flatum et afflationem, ut sic loquar, significat, docere potest) ipsius Dei vim et efficaciam quandam, i. e. eam, quæ secum sanctitatem aliquam afferat, etc. Comp. Bibl. Fratr. Pol. ii. p. 445*b*: Spiritum Sanctum virtutem Dei atque efficaciam, qua aliquo modo res ab ipso Deo sanctificantur, esse credimus. Personam vero ipsum Spiritum Sanctum, proprie et in potiorem significatum acceptum, et ab ipso Deo, cujus est spiritus, distinctum esse, negamus. Sanctam motionem, creatam a Deo in anima hominis, metonymice auctorem rei pro re ipsa nominando, Spiritum Sanctum appellari posse, dubitari nequit. Sed aliud est appellari posse, aliud vero re ipsa esse. According to the Socinians, the doctrine of the Trinity is equally opposed to Scripture[1] and to reason; they combated it on both grounds; see *Fock*, Socinianismus, s. 454 ff. *Schneckenburger*, s. 40 ff.

(5) The Confess. Remonstr. c. 3, was indeed silent on the subject of subordination, but *Episcopius* expressed himself as follows, Inst. Theol. 4. 2, 42, p. 333: Sed addo, certum esse ex Scripturis, personis his tribus divinitatem divinasque perfectiones tribui non collateraliter aut coordinate, sed subordi-

[1] 1 John v. 7 is not genuine; but even if so, it asserts only the agreement in testimony, and not the unity of essence.

nate, ita ut pater solus naturam istam divinam et perfectiones istas divinas a se habeat sive a nullo alio, filius autem et Spir. S. a patre; ac proinde pater divinitatis omnis, quæ in filio et spiritu sancto est, fons ac principium sit.—*Limborch*, Theol. Christ. ii. 17, § 25: Colligimus, essentiam divinam et filio et spiritui sancto esse communem. Sed et non minus constat, inter tres hasce personas subordinationem esse quandam, quatenus, pater naturam divinam a se habet, filius et spir. s. a patre, qui proinde divinitatis in filio et spiritu sancto fons est et principium. Communis christianorum consensus ordinis ratione prærogativam hanc agnoscit, patri semper tribuens primum locum, secundum filio, tertium spiritui sancto. Sed et est quædam supereminentia, patris respectu filii, et patris ac filii respectu spiritus sancti, ratione dignitatis ac potestatis. Dignius siquidem est generare, quam generari, spirare quam spirari, etc.

(6) [Bishop *Bull's* Defensio Fidei Nicen. 1680, was intended to restore the authority of the early Fathers of the Church, which had been abandoned by some of the orthodox. Petavius even had endeavoured to show that little dependence could be placed upon them. Bull's mode of discussion is historical rather than metaphysical. He held to a subordination of the Son in the divine essence, while opposing Tritheism, Arianism, and Sabellianism.—The controversy was carried over into the metaphysical question by *Dr. Wm. Sherlock*, in his Vindication of the Doctrine of the Trinity, 1690. Dr. Sherlock proposed an "easy and intelligible" mode of explaining the Trinity. But he was opposed as tritheistic by *Dr. Wallis* and by *Robert South*. The two latter were accused of Sabellianism. The parties were termed *tritheists* and *nominalists*. In this controversy Bull took no direct part, but some of the points are discussed in his posthumous work, Discourse on the Doctrine of the Catholic Church in the first three Centuries. *Cudworth's* Intellectual System, and *Stillingfleet's* Vindication of the Trinity, 1697, appeared about the same time. The discussion was continued between *Samuel Clarke* and *Waterland*, turning upon the possibility of a kind of second and inferior deity, which was maintained by Clarke, who appealed from the Fathers to the Scriptures. His position was hardly different from that of the high Arians. Dr. Water-

land replied, vindicating the eternity and consubstantiality of the Son, and exploding the distinction between absolute and relative deity.]

§ 263.

The Systematic Development of the Doctrine concerning God, together with its Mystical and Speculative Aspect.

Faith in the Trinity served as a basis for the further development of theology in the Protestant Church. Among the arguments for the *existence of God*, the ontological proof was revived by *Descartes* (1). Most doctrinal writers of this period, however, made the historical fact of a divine revelation to man the starting-point of their systems, and thus necessarily presupposed the metaphysical existence of God (2). They indulged more freely in definitions respecting His attributes, adopting for the most part the scholastic method of investigation (3). But the doctrine of the Trinity in particular was further carried out both by systematic and argumentative theologians, and by theosophic mystics. The theology of the schools, which even went so far as to make salvation dependent upon dogmatic definitions (4), made a distinction between the relation in which the divine persons stand to each other (opera ad intra), and the relation in which they stand to the world and to mankind (opera ad extra), which were again variously subdivided (5). On the other hand, the mystics endeavoured to fathom the depths of the mystery, but in doing this frequently confounded theology with natural philosophy (6).

(1) *Cartesii* Meditatt. de Prima Philos. in quibus Dei Existentia et Animæ humanæ a Corpore Distinctio demonstratur, Amst. 1641, 4to (1654). — Principia Philosophiæ, Amst. 1650, 4to, Lib. i. c. 14: Considerans deinde inter diversas ideas, quas apud se habet (mens), unam esse entis summe intelligentis, summe potentis et summe perfecti, quæ omnium longe præcipua est, agnoscit in ipsa existentiam non

possibilem et contingentem tantum, quemadmodum in ideis aliarum omnium rerum, quas distincte percipit, sed omnino necessariam et æternam. Atque ut ex eo, quod, exempli causa, percipiat in idea trianguli necessario contineri, tres ejus angulos æquales esse duobus rectis, plane sibi persuadet triangulum tres angulos habere æquales duobus rectis, ita ex eo solo, quod percipiat existentiam necessariam et æternam in entis summe perfecti idea contineri, plane concludere debet, ens summe perfectum existere. (As regards the question whether God may be known or not, Descartes appropriately distinguished between comprehendere Deum and intelligere. The former is denied to us, the latter alone is permitted, l.c. c. 19.)

(2) *Melanchthon* speaks of the consciousness of God implanted in man; see his Locus de Deo (Corpus Reform. xxi. p. 107), and the passages cited by *Heppe*, s. 261 ff. *Luther* speaks in the same way (ibid. s. 264 ff.). On the proofs for the existence of God, *Baier* observes, p. 159: Esse Deum inter christianos supponi magis, quam probari debere videri potest; quia tamen non solum cum Atheis, verum etiam alias ob corruptionem naturæ cum dubitationibus mentium nostrarum decertandum est: *ideo non sunt negligendi*, qui Dei existentiam probant. Most of the earlier orthodox theologians made no mention of these arguments, and it was not till after the time of Wolf "*that they were held to be as momentous as if the existence or non-existence of God depended on them;*" *Hase*, Hutterus Redivivus, p. 126. Yet still it was a part of orthodoxy to hold that the existence of God could be proved. Thus the Consensus Repetitus, Punct. 10 (in *Henke's* ed. p. 9), says against *Calixt:* Rejicimus eos, qui docent, quod sit Deus, non debere a Theologo probari, sed tamquam naturaliter supponi.

(3) The divine attributes were not called *proprietates* (which have reference to the relations of the Trinity, comp. note 4), but *attributa* Dei, *i.e.* conceptus essentiales, quibus notio Dei absolvitur; these again were subdivided into quiescentia and transeuntia, etc. See *Hollaz*, p. 235: Attributa divina ab essentia divina et a se invicem distinguuntur non *nominaliter*, neque *realiter*, sed *formaliter*, sec. nostrum concipiendi modum, non sine certo distinctionis fundamento. On the particular attributes, compare the compendiums of *De Wette*, p. 56; *Hase*, Hutterus Redivivus, p. 135 ss. Among

the Reformed, the doctrine of the divine attributes was most completely developed by *Hyperius* and *Ursinus;* see *Heppe,* Dogm. d. deutsch. Protest. i. s. 274. The Socinians (like Origen) limited the *omniscience* of God; see *Dorner* (review of *Winers* Symb. in the Stud. und Kritik. 1838, 2).[1]

(4) After the manner of the Athanasian symbol, "Quicunque vult salvus esse," etc., the Consensus Repetitus, Punct. 11 (in *Henke,* p. 10), declares: Rejicimus eos, qui docent, quod sufficiat credere unum esse Deum, qui pater sit et filius et spiritus sanctus, neque ad credenda sive ad articulos fidei proprie stricteque ita dictos, *quorum videlicet ignorantia salutem excludit,* pertineant notiones divinæ, proprietates et relationes, quomodo et a se invicem et ab essentia modaliter sive alio modo distinguantur personasve constituant, etc.

(5) *A.* The opera ad intra (notæ internæ) constitute the character hypostaticus of each person. They are immanent, and may be divided into—*a. Actus personales:* (*α*) Pater generat filium et spirat Spiritum. (*β*) Filius generatur a Patre, spirat cum Patre Spir. Sanctum. (*γ*) Spir. S. procedit a Patre Filioque. *b. Proprietates personales:* (*α*) Paternitas, (*β*) Filiatio s. generatio passiva. (*γ*) Spiratio passiva. *c. Notiones personales:* *ἀγεννησία* et spiratio activa. *d. Ordo subsistendi:* Pater est prima, Filius secunda et Spiritus tertia persona deitatis.—*B.* The opera ad extra may be divided into—*a. Opera œconomica,* i. e. ea, quæ Deus facit ad reparandam generis humani salutem æternam. (*α*) Pater ablegavit Filium ad homines redimendos, et mittit Spir. Sanct. ad homines regenerandos et sanctificandos. (*β*) Filius redemit genus humanum et mittit Spir. S. (*γ*) Spir. S. mittitur in animos hominum, eosque participes reddit salutis per Christum partæ. *b. Opera*

[1] How much *Luther* avoided all scholastic subtlety in his definitions of the divine attributes, *e.g.* the omnipresence of God, may be seen from one passage taken from his treatise, Bekenntniss vom Abendmahl (*Walch,* xx. 1202): "We say that God is not such an outstretched, long, broad, thick, high, deep being, but a supernatural, incomprehensible being, existing wholly in every small grain, and yet at the same time *in, above,* and *beyond* all creatures; hence there can be no limitation such as man fancies. . . . Nothing is so small but that God is still smaller; nothing so great, but that God is still greater; nothing so short, but that God is still shorter; nothing so long, but that God is still longer; nothing so broad, but that God is still broader; nothing so narrow, but that God is still narrower. Thus He is an incomprehensible and ineffable being, above and beyond all that we may name or think."

attributiva (communia), i. e. ea, quæ, quamquam sint tribus personis communia, tamen in Script. S. plerumque adscribuntur singulis. (*α*) Pater creavit, conservat, et gubernat omnia per Filium. (*β*) Filius creavit mundum, mortuos resuscitabit atque judicium extremum exercebit. (*γ*) Spir. S. inspiravit prophetas. Compare *De Wette*, s. 81, where an estimate is given in the light of doctrinal history; *Hase*, Hutterus Redivivus, p. 173; *Heppe*, s. 292 ff.

(6) *J. Böhm*, Myster. Magn. vii. 6 (in *Wullen*, s. 5): "When it is said of God, that He is Father, Son, and Spirit, it is right well so said; but it must be explained, or else the unillumined soul will not comprehend it. The Father is the Will of the Uncaused (*Ungrund*); He is also external to all nature, external to all that has beginning, the producing Will, who concentrates Himself in a desire for self-revelation." . . . 7: "This Desire is the determinative Power of the Will or of the Father, it is His Son, Heart, and Seat, the first, eternal beginning in the Will, and is called Son, because it takes its eternal origin in the Will, when the Will is first determined." . . . 8: "The Will thus expresses itself in and by this self-determination as an out-breathing or a revelation; and this outgoing of the Will in speaking or breathing is the Spirit of the Deity, or the Third Person, as the ancient Church alleges." Theosophische Fragen, ii. 2, 3 (*Wullen*, s. 8): "The Will is a mere willing desire of love, a proceeding from itself to its susceptibility. The Will is the eternal, aboriginal Father, and the susceptibility of love is the eternal Son, whom the Will generates in itself to an emotional capacity of love, and the proceeding of the willing, susceptible love is the Spirit of the divine life. And thus the eternal unity is a threefold, immeasurable life without beginning, which consists in mere willing, purpose, and susceptibility in and of itself, and in an eternal proceeding from itself." . . . Morgenröthe im Aufgang, iii. 14 (in *Wullen*, s. 9): "The Father is all, and all power consists in the Father, He is the beginning and the end of all things, and besides Him there is nothing, and all that has come to be, comes from the Father; for before the beginning of creation there was nothing but God alone. But now thou must not think that the Son is another God than the Father, that He is outside of the Father, as when two men

stand alongside one another, the one of whom does not comprehend the other. No, this is not the relation between the Father and the Son, for the Father is not an image that can be compared with anything; but the Father is the fountain of all powers, and all powers are in one another as one power; hence He is also called the one only God. If His powers were separated, He were not almighty; but now He is the independent almighty and all-powerful God;" iii. 15: "The Son is the heart in the Father, the heart or the kernel in all the powers of the whole Father. From the Son ascends the eternal, heavenly joy, springing up in all the powers of the Father, a joy which no eye hath seen," etc.; iii. 28: "Just as the three elements, fire, air, and water, proceed from the sun and the stars, and make the living movement and the spirit of all creatures in this world; so, too, the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Father and the Son, and makes the living movement in all the powers of the Father. And just as the three elements move in the depth as an independent spirit, although flowing forth from the power of all the stars, and just as all the forces of the sun and the stars are in the three elements, as if these were themselves the sun and the stars; so the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Father and the Son, He moves in the whole Father, and is the life and spirit of all the forces in the whole Father." Von dem dreifachen Leben des Menschen, vii. 22. (in *Wullen*, s. 25): "God is threefold in persons, and willed to move Himself in a threefold way according to the property of each person, and no more in eternity. First, the centre of the nature of the Father moved itself to the creation of angels, and then to this world. Next, the nature of the Son moved itself, wherein the heart of God became man, and this will not happen again in eternity; and that it occurred was through the same one man, who is God through many in many. Thirdly, at the end of the world the nature of the Holy Spirit will move itself, and the dead will arise. Thus the Holy Spirit will be the mover, who will put the great wonders, which are done in this world, all in the eternal essence, to the honour of God and to the joy of the creature; and He will be the eternal mover of the creatures, for through Him Paradise, which we have lost here, blossoms again." Erste Schutzschr. wider Balth. Tilken, 406 (in *Wullen*,

s. 69: "He that seizes hold upon the one living God, has hold upon the holy Trinity."

With Calixtus and his disciples there was a controversy on the question, how far the Trinity was contained in the Old Testament; see *Schmid*, Dogmatik, s. 347 ff. Consensus Repetitus Fidei, Punct. 13 (in *Henke*, p. 11): Rejicimus eos, qui docent, in libris Vet. Test. vestigia Trinitatis potius, quam aperta animumque convincentia dicta reperiri, seu insinuari potius, quam clare proponi Trinitatis mysterium. Proof-texts: Gen. xxvi.; Ps. xxxiii. 6, etc.

§ 264.

Creation and Preservation of the World. Providence and Government of the World.

Theologians of all parties agreed in the theistic conception of the divine nature, and, consequently, in supposing that God performed a real creative act—that is, a *creation out of nothing* (1). The mystics, however, promoted more than ever before the pantheistic tendency (2). The speculative systems of the age were favourable either to pantheistic tendencies, by which God and the world were confounded, or to deistic principles, which banished the Creator from His works (3). The results of the newly cultivated study of the natural sciences already appeared irreconcilable with the literal interpretation of the Mosaic account of the creation of the world (4). The doctrines concerning the preservation of the world (5), concerning providence and the government of the world (6), propounded by earlier theologians, received their further dogmatic development in the theological systems of the present age. *Leibnitz* elevated *Theodicy* into a philosophical science (7).

(1) The prolific and genial soul of *Luther*, and his fresh love of nature, led him to view the work of creation with the eye of a pious poet rather than with that of a subtle scholastic, as may be seen from many humorous and witty passages in his "Table Talk," etc. To questions such as, What was God

doing *before* the creation of the world? he replied ironically.[1] *Melanchthon*, on the other hand, had a special Locus de Creatione in his system (edition of 1543, Corpus Reform. xxi. p. 638), in which, wholly in the sense of Luther, he points to the necessary connection between creation and preservation (see note 5). *Zwingli*, too, shows, in his treatise, De providentia, and elsewhere, a fine perception of nature.—*Calvin* had less susceptibility to nature (see *Henry*, i. s. 484 f.), and hence did not view the world as much from the æsthetic side as Luther did. Nevertheless, comp. Instit. i. c. 14, p. 53: Interea ne pigeat in hoc pulcherrimo theatro piam oblectationem capere ex manifestis et obviis Dei operibus. Est enim hoc . . . etsi non præcipuum, naturæ tamen ordine primum fidei documentum, quaquaversum oculos circumferamus, omnia quæ occurrunt meminisse Dei esse opera, et simul quem in finem a Deo condita sint pia cogitatione reputare. . . . Verum quia nunc in didactico versamur genere, ab iis supersedere nos convenit, quæ longas declamationes requirunt. Ergo, ut compendio studeam, tunc sciant lectores se vera fide apprehendisse, quid sit Deum cœli et terræ esse creatorem, si illam primum universalem regulam sequantur, ut, quas in suis creaturis Deus exhibet conspicuas virtutes, non ingrata vel incogitantia vel oblivione transeant; deinde sic ad se applicare discant, quo penitus afficiantur in suis cordibus.—In the symbolical books only a passing reference is made to the doctrine of creation, because there was no occasion for entering into controversies; the expressions there used have regard to the practical rather than the doctrinal aspects of this subject. Comp. *e.g.* the Catech. Major of Luther, Art. 1.—On the other hand, later theologians more fully developed the idea of creatio ex nihilo. They made a distinction between nihil privativum (materia inhabilis et rudis) and nihil negativum (non-existence generally, negatio omnis entitatis), and maintained the creation out of nothing in both respects.—To the questions, whether there was any time antecedent to the creation of the world, or, whether God created *time* when He created the *world?* some replied (with Augustine): mundum esse *conditum* cum tempore.

[1] His reply to the question, Where was God before He made the world? was: "In the birch-grove, cutting rods to punish impertinent questioners." *Hase*, Gnosis, ii. s. 183. Comp. his Introduction to Genesis.

But other theologians (Reformed), supposing the previous existence of time, fixed upon different periods as those in which God created the world; thus *Alsted* decided in favour of the spring, *Heidegger* gave the preference to autumn.[1] *Calov.* iii. 909, adopted an intermediate view: God created non *in* tempore proprie, sed in primo instanti ac principio temporis; and *Hollaz* said, p. 359: *in* tempore non præexistente, sed co-existente. Compare the passages quoted by *De Wette*, s. 61; *Hase*, Hutterus Redivivus, p. 152; *Heppe*, s. 305 ff.—Theologians (such as *Gerhard, Quenstedt, Hollaz, Alsted*) further distinguished between Creatio prima seu immediata (*i.e.* the creation of matter), and Creatio secunda seu mediata (*i.e.* the creation of form).[2]—The real object of the creation of the world (finis ultimus) was thus defined by *Calov.* iii. 900: ut bonitas, sapientia, et potentia Dei a creaturis rationabilibus celebraretur, in creaturis universis agnosceretur; the subordinate end (finis intermedius) is the happiness of the creature. Comp. *Heidegger*, vi. 18; *De Wette*, s. 61 f.[3] On the Socinian idea of creation, see *Fock*, s. 478 ff. "*It can scarcely be doubted, that Socinianism did not teach a creation from nothing, but rather a creation from pre-existent matter.*" De Vera Religione, ii. 4: Ideo Deus ex nihilo omnia fecisse dicitur, quia ea creavit ex materia informi, hoc est ejusmodi, quæ nec actu nec naturali aliqua potentia seu inclinatione id fuerit, quod postea ex ea fuit formatum, ita ut, nisi vis quædam infinita accessisset, nunquam quicquam ex ea fuisset exstiturum. (Proof-passages given are 2 Macc. vii. 28, interpreted after Wisd. xi. 18 and Heb. xi. 3.)

[1] Towards the beginning of the last century, *Hogel*, a rector in Gera, actually discovered that God commenced the work of creation, Oct. 26, towards the evening. See *Hase*, Gnosis, l.c.

[2] We are reminded of the old scholasticism by the question, whether lice, fleas, and such like vermin, quæ vel ex varia diversarum specierum commixtione vel ex putredine aut consimili quadam ratione hodie enascuntur, were created in primo creationis sextiduo? *Haffenreffer* replies, that they were not existing *actu*, but *potentia*, i. e. in aliis animalium speciebus et materiæ habilitate latuerunt, see *Heppe*, Gnos. s. 413, note.

[3] It is evident from what has been said respecting the different opinions concerning the Trinity, that Trinitarians alone would ascribe the work of creation to all the persons, which was denied by Unitarians. But the Arminians and Mennonites also referred it to the *Father* in particular. Compare the passages quoted by *Neudecker*, s. 347 ff.

(2) *Sebastian Frank*, Paradoxa, 332*b* (in *Erbkam*, s. 356): "God alone is mover and worker of all things; all creatures do nothing really to their work actively, but only passively. The creature acts not, but is acted upon; as God works through each, so it works; the creature only holds still, and is passive to God; . . . for the bird does not really sing and fly, but is besung and borne up in the air; it is *God* that *sings, lives, moves,* and *flies in it.* He is the essence of all essences, so that all creatures are full of Him, and do and are nothing else but what God says and wills." *Jacob Böhm*, Mysterium Magnum, 1. 2 (in *Wullen*, s. 4): "God is the one in relation to the creature, as an *eternal nothing;* He has neither a foundation, nor beginning, nor a place (of abode), and possesses nothing but Himself. He is the will of that which has no ground, in Himself He is only one; He needs no place or space; from eternity to eternity He begets Himself in Himself," etc. Theosoph. Sendschreiben, 47. 4 (in *Wullen*, s. 13): "In God all essences are only one essence, an eternal unity, the one eternal good; but the eternal unity could not become manifest to Himself if there were no sundering. Therefore it breathed itself out from itself in such a way, that it introduced a plurality and distinctions in its own will and in properties, and the properties in desires, and the desires in beings." Von der Geburt und Bezeichnung aller Wesen, 16. 1 (*Wullen*, s. 21): "Creation is nothing but a manifestation of the all-essential, unfathomable God; all that He is in His eternal never-beginning generation, that also is creation, but not in His omnipotence and power." C. 11: "The being of beings is only one being, but in His generation He separates Himself into light and darkness, joy and sorrow, good and evil, love and hatred, fire and light, and out of these two eternal beginnings arises the third beginning, namely, the creation for His own delight, and according to His eternal desire." Von dem dreifachen Leben des Menschen, vi. 5 (*Wullen*, s. 23): "God Himself is the being of all beings, and we are as gods in Him, through whom He manifests Himself." (The same ideas are expressed in several other passages.)—The same mystical pantheism pervades the (poetical) works of *Scheffler* (Angelus Silesius). Compare the passages quoted by *Wackernagel*, Leseb. ii. Sp. 431 ff.

Hagenbach, Vorlesungen über die Reformation, iv. s. 424.—These mystics widely differed from the pietists; see *Spener*, Theologische Bedenken, iii. 302 (in *Hennicke*, s. 24): "Thus there remains such an infinite distinction between God and the creature,[1] that both beings are not one being, though they are most intimately connected with each other."

(3) Thus the theory of *Leibnitz*, his doctrine of monads and pre-established harmony, was opposed to the scriptural and ecclesiastical doctrine of creation, inasmuch as by the assumption of the existence of atoms (Entelechien) the Creator was thrown too much into the background; on the other hand, the pantheism of *Spinoza* (all-God and akosmic) virtually destroyed the idea of *creation* (*i.e.* in the biblical and theological sense).

(4) Concerning the pre-Adamite controversy, see above, § 248, note 1.

(5) The preservation of the world was understood as a Creatio continua, perennis.—*Melanchthon* (in Loc. de Creatione): Infirmitas humana, etiamsi cogitat Deum esse conditorem, tamen postea imaginatur, ut faber discedit a navi exstructa, et relinquit eam nautis, ita Deum discedere a suo opere, et relinqui creaturas tantum propriæ gubernationi. . . . Adversus has dubitationes confirmandæ sunt mentes cogitatione vera articuli de creatione, ac statuendum est non solum conditas esse res a Deo, sed etiam perpetuo servari et sustentari a Deo rerum substantias. Adest Deus suæ creaturæ, sed non adest ut stoicus Deus, sed ut agens liberrimum, sustentans creaturam, et sua immensa misericordia moderans, dans bona, adjuvans aut impediens causas secundas. So, too, *Zwingli* (Opera, iii. p. 156): Et natura, quid aliud est, quam continens perpetuaque Dei operatio rerumque omnium dispositio? Zwingli also indicates that the constant preservation of creation deserves our admiration as much as a miracle. De prov. Dei (Opp. iv. 2, p. 129).

(6) In reference to the object of providence, distinctions were made between providentia generalis, specialis, and specialissima; in reference to the order of nature, between naturalis (ordinaria, mediata) and supernaturalis (miraculosa, immediata);[2] in reference to the moral actions of men, between

[1] By creature he understands in this place the believer, and not the world.

[2] Or the idea of miracle, see *Hase*, Hutterus Redivivus, p. 160 s.

permittens, impediens, dirigens, limitans, etc. The older theologians, *Hutter, Gerhard, Calov*, divided the providence of God simply into the two acts of conservatio and gubernatio. To these *Quenstedt* added as the third act, the concursus Dei ad causas secundas (*Heppe*, s. 316), defining it as *the* actus, quo libertas agendi hominibus conservatur: thus in Qu. i. p. 531, concerning the actus providentiæ, quo Deus influxu generali in actiones et effectus causarum secundarum, qua tales, immediate et simul cum eis et juxta indigentiam et exigentiam uniuscujusque suaviter influit.—In the language of philosophers, this system, developed by *Descartes, Malebranche*, and *Bayle*, was termed the system of *Occasionalism*. On the doctrine of the Reformed Church as to Providence, see *Heppe*, i. s. 317 ff.

(7) Essai de Théodicée sur la Bonté de Dieu, la Liberté de l'Homme, et l'Origine du Mal, Amst. 1710, 2 parts, often republished. The system of *Optimism*.

§ 265.

Angels and Devils.

Protestants as well as Roman Catholics (1) continued to rest their faith in the real existence both of angels and demons on the authority of Scripture, and to believe in the power of the devil as something which still manifests itself in the life of men (2). In the symbolical books only a passing reference was occasionally made to these doctrines (3), while the theologians here again adopted and carried out the definitions of the scholastics (4). *Christian Thomasius* and *Balthasar Bekker* combated the belief in the devil as well as that in witches; but the former only cautiously rejected the opinion that the devil still exerts a physical influence upon men (5); while the latter, more bold and daring, represented his existence itself as very doubtful (6).

(1) There was only this difference between Protestants and Roman Catholics, that the latter added the invocation of the

angels. Comp. above § 257, note 2. The Protestants did not allow this, although they believed that the angels interceded for us. Apol. Aug. p. 311; Conf. Wurtem. p. 526 (in *Heppe*, s. 329): Angeli pro nobis sunt solliciti. Luther also believed in guardian angels, but without making it a dogma; *Heppe*, s. 330. Socinians (like the older divines) held that angels were created before the rest of the creation, see *Fock*, s. 484.

(2) On *Luther's* diabology, which sometimes borders on Manichæan dualism, see *Schenkel*, ii. s. 133 ff. He even once calls the devil a "god" (Wider die Türken, in *Walch*, xx. s. 2661). His conflicts with him are well known, as also his bold confronting of him. Among other things, he ascribes ubiquity to the devil: "He can be in a whole city, and again in a box or nutshell" (see his Grosse Bekenntniss vom Abendmahl, in *Walch*, xx. s. 1187).—*Melanchthon* speaks of the angels in the edition of the Loci of 1535, at the end (Corp. Ref. xxi. p. 558); in the edition of 1543, in the first Appendix (De Conjugio). *Calvin* and *Zwingli* did not trouble themselves so much with the question of Satanic agency as Luther; see *Henry*, Leben Calvins, i. s. 488 ff. *Schenkel*, ii. s. 146, 156 ff. *Spörri*, Zwinglistudien, s. 14 f. —Various rites were also observed at the exorcism, or ceremony of casting the devil out at baptism.[1]—The trials of witches are a practical proof of the belief then prevailing in the continuance of demoniacal power.

(3) *E.g.* Comp. Helv. II. Art. 7. For further particulars, see *Neudecker*, s. 365.

(4) Compare the passages quoted by *Hase* (Hutterus Redivivus, s. 183 f.) from the works of *Hollaz* and others. These scholastic definitions went beyond what the Reformers held on the simple foundation of Scripture; thus *Calvin* asks: De tempore vel ordine quo creati fuerint (Angeli) contentionem movere, nonne pervicaciæ magis quam diligentiæ est? Inst. i. c. 14. Nevertheless *Heidegger*, a *Calvinistic* theologian, filled twenty columns with his *Breviarium* de Angelis! s. 279–300. Comp. on the whole section, *Heppe*, s. 333 ff.

[1] *Bekker* also observes (Die bezauberte Welt, s. 114) that the opinions of the *Lutherans* concerning the devil resemble the views of the Papists much more than those of the Reformed.

(5) In his "Erinnerungen wegen seiner künftigen Wintervorlesungen," 1702, quoted by *Schröckh*, Allgemeine Biographie, v. s. 349. He denied that the devil has horns, paws, and claws, or at all corresponds to the ordinary representations of him. Nor did he admit that the doctrine concerning the devil is a corner-stone of Christianity, so that if it were removed, the whole edifice must fall.

(6) *Bekker*, in his work, Die bezauberte Welte, by combating the belief of the age in witches, etc., was led to inquire into the manner in which the biblical narratives of the appearances of angels, as well as of the influences exerted by the devil upon man, are to be understood. Though he frequently explained away by arbitrary exegesis what did not agree with his own opinions, he correctly exposed in other places the false consequences which the advocates of a subtle scholasticism, no less than of vulgar superstition, inferred from the misinterpretation of certain passages. He endeavoured in particular to show that Scripture, so far from establishing a *doctrine* concerning angels and devils, speaks of them only occasionally, without fully enlightening us on their nature, as little as it gives complete information respecting the Crethi and Plethi, the Urim and Thummim. See Book ii. c. 8, § 3. "God did not intend to instruct us concerning the *angels*, but concerning *ourselves*" (§ 8). This is the case also with the demons: "Neither the Saviour nor His apostles inform us *how* the devils fell, but at most, *that* they fell . . . this we should consider sufficient" (c. 9, § 1). "And as regards *natural things* (metaphysics), Scripture is not designed to teach us how they are in themselves, but it commands us to contemplate them for the glory of God and the salvation of man" (c. 10, § 15).—In reference to the *angels*, the final result of his inquiries is, that they are real beings, and that God employs them in His service; but they exert no direct influence upon the soul and body of man (c. 15, § 9). He denies the existence of guardian angels (c. 16).—Respecting the *devil* many things are not to be understood literally, but figuratively, *e.g.* the history of our Lord's temptation (Matt. iv.), which he explains as "an interchange of dangerous thoughts" (c. 21, § 17). But there are also other passages which do not support the common theory. In ch. 26 he discusses the

difference between the devil and demons, and in ch. 27 he explains the demoniacal possessions as diseases which "affected the brain," and in which the disease itself was confounded with the demon; in support of his view, he was of course led to suppose (ch. 28) that Jesus "accommodated Himself to the prejudices of the people."—What else Scripture tells us of the devil, "*may easily be understood of wicked men*" (ch. 31). This much at least is to him evident, "that the devil is of less consequence than people generally believe" (c. 32, § 1). "*Let a man only examine his conscience, and there he will see the true beginning, the fountain and source of his trouble and miseries*" (ch. 36, § 18). He admonishes men to fear the great God instead of fearing the devil, and thinks that by lowering the power of the devil he "the more elevates the wisdom and might of the Saviour" (§ 22).

SECOND DIVISION.

CHRISTOLOGY AND SOTERIOLOGY.

(INCLUDING THE DOCTRINE CONCERNING BAPTISM AND ESCHATOLOGY.)

§ 266.

The Person of Christ.

C. H. Weisse, Die Christologie Luthers, Lpz. 1852, 2te Aufl. 1855. **Schneckenburger*, Die orthodoxe Lehre vom doppelten Stande Christi, nach lutherischer und reformirter Fassung, Pforzheim, 1848 (comp. Zellers Jahrbücher, 1844). [*J. A. Dorner*, History of the Development of the Doctrine of the Person of Christ, vol. i., transl., Edinb. 1861.]

Not merely the doctrine of the Trinity, as we have already seen, but also that of the two natures of Christ, remained unaffected by the contests between Protestants and Roman Catholics (1). In reference to the Communicatio idiomatum and the Unio personalis, however, a deep rooted difference of opinion arose between Lutherans and Calvinists in connection with the controversy concerning the sacraments. And here old reminiscences of the strife between Nestorianism and Eutychianism were revived (2); while among the sects various notions respecting the person of Christ made their appearance. Thus *Caspar Schwenkfeld* revived the doctrine, condemned as Eutychian, concerning the "glorified and deified flesh" of Christ (3). *Melchior Hofmann* and *Menno Simonis*, as well as other Anabaptists, supposed (like the Valentinians in the first period) that our Lord's birth was a mere phantom (4). *Michael Servetus* saw in Christ simply a man penetrated by God, and rejected all further distinctions of two natures as

unscriptural and merely scholastic (5). *Faustus Socinus* went so far as to return in full to the view entertained by the Ebionites and Nazarenes, since, in his opinion, Jesus of Nazareth was by nature, notwithstanding His supernatural birth, a mere man, on whom God bestowed extraordinary revelations, and whom He raised to heaven after His death, and committed to Him the government of the Church which He had founded (6). The mystics in general, and the Quakers in particular, attached less importance to the *historical* Christ than to the Christ *in* us, although they were far from denying the former; several of them even espoused various Gnostic theories concerning His humanity and incarnation (7).

(1) It is well known how firmly *Luther* clung to the doctrine of the divinity and incarnation of Christ: "He whom the universe could not contain, lies in Mary's lap," etc. Comp. his Auslegung des Evangeliums am heiligen Christfest (*Walch*, t. xi. s. 171, 176. See *Dorner*, s. 192 f.). He even uses such expressions as these, Mary *nursed God, cradled God, made pap for God;* see *Schenkel*, i. s. 316 (*Walch*, xx. s. 1191, where, however, the passage is not verbally the same). So, too, he did not scruple to say, *God* suffered, *God* died. Comp. his Letters (*De Wette*), vi. s. 291 (to Gross of Mitweida): Vera ecclesia credit, non tantum humanam naturam, sed etiam divinam seu *verum Deum* pro nobis passum esse et mortuum. Et quamquam mori sit alienum a natura Dei, tamen quia natura divina sic induit naturam humanam, ut inseparabiliter conjunctæ sint hæ duæ naturæ, ita ut Christus sit una persona Deus et homo, ut quidquid accidat Deo et homini, ideo fit, ut hæ duæ naturæ in Christo sua idiomata inter se communicent, h. e. quod unius naturæ proprium communicatur quoque alteri propter inseparabilem cohærentiam, ut nasci, pati, mori, etc., sunt humanæ naturæ idiomata seu proprietates, quarum divina natura quoque fit particeps propter inseparabilem illam et tantum fide comprehensibilem conjunctionem. Itaque non tantum homo, sed etiam *Deus concipitur, nascitur ex Maria Virgine, patitur, moritur.*[1] *Zwingli* expresses himself more

[1] The passage adduced in proof from Rom. i. has not *God* (absolutely) for its subject, but the *Son of God.*

soberly and scripturally when he says that Christ "was born without sin of the pure Virgin Mary," and that He was "both true man and true God." In Christ alone he found salvation, the beginning and end of all blessedness; see Uslegung des 5 Artikels (Werke, i. s. 187).—For *Calvin's* doctrine of the person of Christ, see his Instit. Lib. ii. c. 12 ss., especially c. 14 (directed against Servetus). The authors of the symbolical books adopted the definitions of the œcumenical symbols: Conf. Aug. p. 10; Apol. p. 50; Art. Smalc. p. 303; Catech. Major, p. 493 ss.; Form. Concord. Art. 8; De persona Christi, p. 605 ss.—Conf. Bas. I. Art. 4; Helv. II. Art. 11; Belg. 19; Gall. 14; Angl. 2; Conf. Remonstr. 8. 3, etc. With this agree Catech. Roman. i. 3, 8, iv. 5 ss., and the symbols of the Greek Church.

(2) Concerning the connection between this difference and the controversy respecting the sacraments, see *Dorner* (1ste Ausg.), s. 166; *Schenkel*, i. 223 ff.; *Schweizer*, ii. s. 291 ff.; *Ebrard*, ii. s. 635 ff.; *Schneckenburger*, l.c. 31; it was not merely accidental. The difference consisted in this, that the Reformed tenaciously retained the doctrine of two natures in one person, and therefore confined the human nature of the Redeemer to heaven (*i.e.* as His present abode); while the Lutherans supposed (on the basis of the περιχώρησις of John Damascene) a real communication of one nature to the other, on which they rested their belief in the ubiquity of Christ's body. "Where you put God," says *Luther*, "there you must put the humanity (of Christ): they cannot be sundered and riven; it is one person, and the humanity is not to be separated, as master Jack draws off his coat and lays it aside when he goes to bed. . . . The humanity is more closely united with God than is our skin with our flesh, yea, more intimately than body and soul."—*Zwingli*, who held strongly to the distinction of the two natures, thought differently. In order to set aside such Scriptures as appeared favourable to the Lutheran view, he had recourse to what is called the *Allœosis*,[1] concerning which he

[1] Luther, in his Grosses Bekenntniss (*Walch*, xx. s. 1180, 1181), called the Allœosis the devil's mask, and the old witch, mistress Reason, its grandmother; he then continues: "We here condemn and curse the allœosis to hell itself, as the devil's own suggestion." He would prefer the term synecdoche to the word allœosis. But he will allow neither the one nor the other to militate against the theory of the ubiquity of Christ's body, s. 1185.

expressed himself as follows (Exeges. Euch. Negot. Opera, iii. p. 525): Et allœosis, quantum huc attinet, desultus vel transitus ille, aut si mavis permutatio, qua de altera in Christo natura loquentes alterius vocibus utimur. Ut, cum Christus ait; Caro mea vere est cibus, caro proprie est humanæ in illo naturæ, attamen per commutationem h. l. pro divina ponitur natura. Qua ratione enim filius Dei est, ea ratione est animæ cibus. . . . Rursus cum perhibet filium familias a colonis trucidandum, cum filius familias divinitatis ejus nomen sit, pro humana tamen natura accipit; secundum enim istam mori potuit, secundum divinam minime. Cum, inquam, de altera natura prædicatur, quod alterius, id tandem est allœosis aut idiomatum communicatio aut commutatio. Comp. the "Wahrh. Bekenntniss der Diener der Kirche von Zürich, 1545" (in *Winer*, s. 68): "Christ's true human body was not deified (after His ascension into heaven) together with His rational human soul, *i.e.* transformed into God, but only glorified. But this glorification did not annul the essence of the human body, it only freed it from its weakness, and rendered the body glorious, shining, and immortal."[1]—Conf. Helv. II. 11: Non docemus, veritatem corporis Christi a clarificatione desiisse, aut deificatam adeoque sic deificatam esse, ut suas proprietates, quoad corpus et animam, deposuerit ac prorsus in naturam divinam abierit unaque duntaxat substantia esse cœperit. Comp. Conf. Gall. 15; Belg. 19; and other passages quoted by *Winer*, s. 69. Heidelb. Kat., Qu. 47: "But will Christ not be with us to the end of the world, as He has promised? *Ans.* Christ is true man and true God. He is not now on earth according to His human nature, but according to His divinity, majesty, mercy, and spirit, He never forsakes us. Qu. 48. But are the two natures in Christ not then separated from each other, so that the human nature is not in all places where the divine is? *Ans.* By no means: for, as the latter is incomprehensible and everywhere present, it follows, that though it may exist out of the human nature

[1] In opposition to this idea of Christ's body being confined to heaven, *Luther* observed (*Walch*, xx. s. 1000) that it was a childish notion: "In the same manner we used to represent heaven to children with a golden throne in it, and Christ seated on the right hand of His Father, clothed in a surplice, and wearing a golden crown on His head, as we often see in pictures." *Zwingli* earnestly protested against this.

which it has assumed, it nevertheless exists as much in it, and remains personally united with it."

The difference between the Lutheran and the Calvinistic doctrine is expressed in the Form. Concord. (*Hase's* ed.), p. 767: Postquam Christus non communi ratione, ut alius quispium sanctus, in cœlos ascendit, sed ut Apostolus (Eph. iv. 10) testatur, super omnes cœlos ascendit, et revera omnia implet et ubique non tantum ut Deus, verum etiam ut homo, præsens dominatur et regnat a mari ad mare, et usque ad terminos terræ, quemadmodum olim prophetæ de ipso sunt vaticinati et apostoli (Marc. xvi. 20) testantur, quod Christus ipsis ubique cooperatus sit, et sermonem ipsorum sequentibus signis confirmaverit.—The right hand of God is everywhere: Non est certus aliquis et circumscriptus in cœlo locus, sed nihil aliud est, nisi omnipotens Dei virtus, quæ cœlum et terram implet. —The unio personalis does not merely consist in this (p. 768), that they (viz. the two natures of Christ) have the same appellations in common, but it is essential. The authors of the Form. Concord. guarded themselves also against the charge of monophysitic errors (p. 778). Nor is the unio hypostatica merely external and mechanical, quasi duæ illæ naturæ eo modo unitæ sint, quo duo asseres conglutinantur, ut realiter seu re ipsa et vere nullam prorsus communicationem inter se habeant (p. 764); on the other hand, the *effusio* of the divine nature into the human is not so, quasi cum vinum aqua aut oleum de uno vaso in aliud transfunditur (p. 780).—The Roman Catholics, so far from adopting the doctrine of the unio hypostatica, rejected it. Thus *Forer*, *Gregory* of Valentia, and *Petavius*. Comp. *Cotta*, Dissert. de Christo Redemtore, in *Gerhard*, Loci Theol. t. iv. p. 57.

(3) Christology forms the centre of the system of *Schwenkfeld*. Among his writings he developes his views especially in the following: Quæstiones vom Erkanntnus Jesu Christi und seiner Glorien, 1561.—Von der Speyse des ewigen Lebens, 1547.—Vom Worte Gottes, dass kein ander Wort Gottes sei, eigentlich zu reden, denn der Sohn Gottes, Jesus Christus.—He defended himself against the imputation of destroying the humanity of Christ, but asserted that Christ's human nature, in its glorified state, ought to be called *divine*. Accordingly, in his opinion, "the flesh of Christ is not that of

a creature; for it is derived from God, and not merely in the sense that God is the creator of all that is bodily, but in a higher manner; for other men God creates externally to Himself, but not so Christ." On this account Christ is the *natural* Son of God (also according to His humanity); for "God not only imparted His Word to the man Christ, and united it with His flesh, but from the beginning He also bestowed upon Him His own nature, being, and independence, divine treasures, and riches." (Vom Fleisch Christi, s. 140–146, *Dorner*, s. 207 f.) "All that by which Christ is David's son is laid aside and lost (in His divine nature); His whole nature is renewed and deified." (Ibid. s. 176, *Dorner*, s. 210.) Nevertheless he rejected the idea of a twofold body of Christ, but admitted only one flesh, viz. the mortal flesh of Mary assumed by Him: "*This mortal flesh, however, is, in his opinion, not the nature, but only the temporal form of Christ's flesh in His state of humiliation; but he does not succeed in giving us a clear idea of what he means. We shall best understand him, if we suppose that, though the flesh of Christ has a twofold origin, on the one hand from the divine nature, on the other from the flesh of Mary, yet it is essentially only one, inasmuch as it may be considered in a twofold aspect, namely, as divine and as human.*" (*Dorner*, l.c.) "*In his struggle after a clear exhibition of his views, we ought not to overlook the truly speculative element, which manifests itself in the attempt to overcome the separation of the divine and the human.*" Ibid. s. 213. Schwenkfeld formally protests (see *Erbkam*, s. 455) against the identification of his doctrine with that of Valentinus, Marcion, etc., or with that of the Anabaptist, *Melchior Hofmann*. On his (polemical) relation to *Sebastian Frank*, who taught that the seed of God is in the hearts of *all* the elect from youth, and thus abolished the specific difference between Christ and other men, see ibid. s. 447. Schwenkfeld opposes both Docetism and Ebionitism: "Both errors are from one truth, as the spider sucks poison from a noble flower" (Epist. i. s. 292, in *Erbkam*, s. 448). He is most earnest in maintaining the undivided unity of the person of Christ, which did not seem to him to be enough guarded by the orthodox doctrine of two natures. Comp. *G. L. Hahn*, Schwenkfeldii Sententia de Christi Persona et Opere exposita, Vratislav. 1847, and *Erbkam*, s. 443 ff.

(4) This is referred to in the Form. Conc. p. 820: Christum carnem et sanguinem suum non e Maria virgine assumisse, sed de cœlo attulisse. Conf. Belg. Art. 18. On *Menno Simonis*, see *Schyn*, Plen. Deduct. p. 164. At an earlier period *Melchior Hofmann* (died 1532) had propounded similar opinions. Hofmann laid great stress upon the word ἐγένετο, in John i.: the Logos did not merely assume our nature, but He *became* flesh; hence his blasphemous expression: Maledicta sit caro Mariæ! Comp. *Trechsel*, s. 34 f.

(5) Comp. § 263 on the doctrine of the Trinity, and the work of *Servetus*, Christianismi Restitutio, 1553. *Schlüsselburg*, Catal. Hæres. lib. xi. "*It may be said that Michael Servetus developed the idea of Schwenkfeld more harmoniously, but with some essential modifications. . . . Resting on a pantheistic basis, he could say that the flesh of Christ was consubstantial with God, but the same would be true in reference to all.*" *Dorner*, s. 215. Nevertheless he did not say it in reference to all flesh: "*In his opinion, Christ alone is the Son of God, nor is that name to be given to any one else.*" (Ibid.) He calls Christ (in distinction from all other men) naturalis filius, ex vera Dei substantia genitus (De Trinit. i. p. 13). It appears to us that, after a candid examination of his doctrine, more would be found in this theory than "*a mere divine or religious glimmer*" (*Dorner*, s. 216) shed upon the person of Christ, though we admit that this pantheistic Unitarianism might easily take a deistic direction (l.c. s. 217).

(6) Cat. Racov. p. 45: Quænam sunt, quæ ad Christi personam referuntur? Id solum, quod natura sit homo verus, olim quidem, cum in terris viveret, mortalis, nunc vero immortalis. Though the authors of this Confession denied (p. 46 of the last edition) that Jesus was "purus et vulgaris homo," they asserted that *by nature* He was mere *man*, but the *only-begotten* Son of God from the moment of His birth. It was especially to Luke i. 35 that they referred in support of their opinion. This is also very distinctly stated by *Ostorodt*, Underr. vi. 48: "We therefore believe that the essentia or the nature of the Son of God was none other than the essentia of a man, *i.e.* a real man, nor do we know of any other essentia or nature in Him. In addition, we believe that He had a different beginning from all other men, *i.e.* that He

did not receive His beginning and origin from man, but from God Himself, since the Virgin Mary conceived Him of the Holy Ghost, *i.e.* by the power of God; on which account He was also to be called the Son of God. Therefore He is God's Son, even His only-begotten Son, from the beginning of His existence, inasmuch as God never had another such Son, who was conceived in the womb, and born by His own power; for the same reason He may also be termed God's real Son, because He was neither adopted nor the son of any one else, but altogether the Son of God."—Besides His supernatural birth, the Socinians supposed particular transportations to heaven. Cat. Racov. p. 146: Qua ratione ipse Jesus ad ipsius divinæ voluntatis notitiam pervenit? Ea ratione, quod in cœlum ascenderit ibique patrem suum et eam, quam nobis annunciavit, vitam et beatitatem viderit, et ea omnia, quæ docere deberet, ab eodem patre audierit; a quo deinde e cœlo in terram dimissus, Spir. S. immensa copia perfusus fuit, cujus afflatu cuncta, quæ a patre didicit, per locutus est.—Here again we have an instance of that external supernaturalism which is more easily inclined to believe in *miracles* than in the great *mystery;* rather in revelations which Jesus *received* and *communicated* to men, than in the *one* manifestation of God in the flesh; rather in a man who has, as it were, become God than in God becoming man! "*The real heart of the Socinian polemics (against orthodoxy) in all its windings is the position of the absolute difference between the infinite and the finite, God and man,*" *Fock,* s. 529, comp. the whole section, s. 510 ff. And yet they conceded that divine honour is due to Christ since His ascension: God has committed to Him power over all things. Socinianism holds fast to this notion of a delegated divinity. Cat. Racov. 2, 120: Christus vero, etsi *Deus verus* sit, non est tamen ille ex se unus Deus, qui per se et perfectissima ratione Deus est, quum is Deus tantum sit Pater. —The invocation of Christ is allowed, but not enjoined; it is an adiaphoron, an unessential. See *Fock,* s. 536 ff., 543 ff. *Schneckenburger,* s. 51.

(7) *Luther* himself combined with the orthodox doctrine of the person of Christ, which obtained in the Roman Catholic Church, also the mystical one he derived from the work already mentioned, Die deutsche Theologie. Comp. *Dorner*

s. 193. "*The whole of Luther's preaching respecting the person and work of Christ moves in the sphere of concrete representations, like nature, and handles these with such living power, always bringing before the mental vision what is actual and essential, as prevents the constraint of dogmas, and shows the poverty of mere language in exhausting the full glory of the divine acts.*" *Gass*, s. 36.—Respecting the opinions of the Quakers, see *Barclay*, Apol. Thes. 13. 2, p. 288 (in *Winer*, s. 71).—According to *Weigel*, Christ is the Divine Spirit in man, the *Word*, the divine idea. Incarnations of this Word took place *before* Christ; thus in the case of Adam, Abraham, etc. He also supposed (like the Quakers) two bodies of Christ. "He did not derive His flesh and blood from the earthly virgin or from Adam, but from the *eternal* virgin through the Holy Ghost, in order that we, by means of this heavenly flesh, might become new creatures, that henceforth *we* might not be earthy, owing our existence to Adam, but heavenly, being created by Christ, and in such flesh possess heaven." . . . But this divine body was invisible, immortal. Christ, in order that He might dwell among us on earth, and do us good, assumed a visible body in the womb of the Virgin Mary; "for who could exist near the sun if it were among men upon earth?" Similar views were entertained by *Jacob Böhm* and *Poiret*. Concerning the former, see *Baur*, Gnosis, s. 596–604, and the passages quoted by *Wullen;* respecting the latter, a full account is given by *Dorner*, s. 231 ff., note, after *Poiret's* Economie Divine ou Système Universel, 5 vols., Amst. 1687. According to ch. xi. of this treatise, the (ideal) Son of God assumed human nature soon *after* the creation of man, and *before* his fall, in such a manner that He (the Son of God) took from Adam His body and a divine soul. *Poiret* also ascribed to Christ, previous to His incarnation in the Virgin Mary, not only various manifestations, but also human "emotions and sufferings," and an unwearying intercession for mankind, His brethren (His office as high priest). But in the Virgin Mary He assumed *mortal* flesh. "The body of Jesus Christ, assuming the flesh and blood of the blessed Virgin, is as little composed of two different bodies as a white and shining garment, dipped in a vessel full of dark colour, and coming into contact with the matter which composes this darkness, is thereby

changed into a double garment, or into two garments instead of one." (Comp. *Schwenkfeld*, note 3.)

§ 267.

Further Doctrinal Development and Internal Controversies.

Schneckenburger, Die orthodoxe Lehre vom doppelten Stande Christi, etc., 1848. [Dr. *A. Bruce* on the Humiliation of Christ, Edin. 1876.]

The doctrine respecting the person of Christ was still further developed in the dogmatic systems of the Lutheran and the Reformed Churches (1). The theologians of the Lutheran Church developed this Locus de persona Christi by distinguishing between three different genera of the communicatio idiomatum (2), which were brought into connection with the two states of Christ's exaltation and humiliation (status exaltationis et inanitionis) (3). To this they added the presentation of the three offices of Christ, the prophetical, the high-priestly, and the kingly office (4). These definitions owed their origin in part to temporary controversies within the Lutheran Church, such as the controversy between the theologians of Giessen and those of Tübingen, at the commencement of the seventeenth century, concerning the κένωσις and κρύψις of the divine attributes (5), and the controversy carried on by *Æpinus*, in a previous century, respecting the Descensus Christi ad inferos (6).

(1) The difference between the Lutherans and the Reformed is as follows: (*a*) The Lutherans made a distinction between incarnation and humiliation, while the Reformed kept both together in one conception. (*b*) Consequently, according to the Lutherans, the conception and birth of the God-man is an act of His own will, He as God-man being conceived as in some way pre-existent; while according to the Reformed, only the λόγος ἄσαρκος pre-existed, and as such assumed humanity, and thus the God-man came to be. (*c*) According to the Lutherans, the God-man, in virtue of the unio personalis, is

received into the *Collegium Trinitatis*, and has part in all divine properties; while, according to the Reformed, the Logos continues to act, as a person of the Trinity, external to the divine-human personality. This had the appearance, as though the Reformed taught that there was only a *gratiosa inhabitatio* of the Logos in Christ; while the Lutherans did not escape the accusation of Docetism. See *Schneckenburger*, ubi supra, and the following notes.

(2) 1. *Genus idiomaticum*, according to which *both natures* so communicate their properties to the *person* (of Christ), that it has both in itself. 2. *Genus apotelesmaticum*, which consists in this, that the person so communicates itself to the two natures, that certain works which belong to the whole person (such as redeeming) are conferred upon one nature alone, and carried out through it. 3. *Genus auchematicum* (majestaticum), mutual communication of the natures to each other by means of the communication of their properties. But inasmuch as the divine nature can neither receive anything from the human, nor suffer any loss, we can only speak of the communication of divine properties to the human nature, whence the name (from *αὔχημα*).—The Genus idiomaticum itself was subdivided into three species—viz.: (*a*) *ἀντίδοσις* (alternatio); (*b*) *κοινωνία τῶν θείων*; (*c*) *ἰδιοποίησις*. (On the defects of this division, see *Hase*, Hutterus Redivivus, p. 241.)

(3) The theory had its origin in the controversy mentioned note 5, and was more precisely defined by the theologians of Saxony as follows: Status exinanitionis (humiliationis) est ea Christi conditio, in qua sec. humanum naturam, in unione personali consideratam, a majestatis divinæ perpetuo usu abstinuit atque obedientiam usque ad mortem præstitit. Status exaltationis, quo Christus sec. humanum naturam, depositis infirmitatibus carnis, plenarium divinæ majestatis usum obtinuit. Comp. also passages from *Gerhard*, in *Gass*, s. 276 f. The theologians of the Reformed Church simply referred the two states to the two natures. According to the Lutherans, the birth of Christ, His circumcision, His subjection to His parents, His intercourse with men who were unworthy of it, His sufferings, death, and burial, belong to the state of humiliation; the Descensus ad inferos (Art. 9 in the Form. Concord. directed against *Æpinus* and the Calvinists,

see note 6), His resurrection from the dead, His ascension into heaven, and sitting at the right hand of God, belong to the state of exaltation.—On the contrary, the Reformed, denying that Christ actually descended to hell, and interpreting the passages bearing upon this point of His mental sufferings and dreadful anguish, or as an equivalent for His real death, maintained that the Descensus ad inferos belongs to the status exinanitionis. See *Schneckenburger*, l.c., second division.

(4) The Munus propheticum has reference to Christ's office as a teacher and messenger sent by God to reveal His will; the Munus sacerdotale has respect to His atoning death (comp. the next section) and priestly intercession (satisfactio et intercessio); the object of the Munus regium is, in the first instance, the foundation and government of the Church; but it also includes the government of the world; on which account a distinction was made between a kingdom of power and a kingdom of grace (the kingdom of heaven). *Gerhard:* Regnum potentiæ est generale dominium super omnia, videlicet gubernatio cœli et terræ, subjectio omnium creaturarum, dominium in medio inimicorum, quos reprimit, coërcet, et punit. Regnum gratiæ est specialis operatio gratiæ in ecclesia, videlicet missio, illuminatio, ac conservatio apostolorum, doctorum, et pastorum, collectio ecclesiæ per prædicationem evangelii et dispensationem sacramentorum, regeneratio, etc. Regnum gloriæ conspicietur in resuscitatione mortuorum et universali judicio ejusque executione. Comp. *Theod. Thummius*, De triplici Christi Officio, Tub. 1627, 4to. — On the different view of the Reformed, see *Schneckenburger*, third division. In particular, the Reformed limited the regal office to the regnum gratiæ. (Prayers to Christ.)

(5) The theologians of Tübingen (*Lucas Osiander, Theod. Thummius*, and *Melchior Nicolai*) supposed that Christ, during His state of humiliation, continued to possess the divine properties of omnipotence, omnipresence, etc., but concealed them from men; the theologians of Giessen (*Mentzer* and *Feuerborn*) asserted that He voluntarily laid them aside. For further particulars, see *Dorner*, s. 179 ff. *Schröckh*, iv. s. 670 ff. Comp. *Thummii ταπεινωσιγραφία* sacra, Tub. 1623, 4to, and *Nicolai*, Consideratio Theolog. IV. Quæstionum controversarum de profundissima *κενώσει* Christi, ibidem 1622, 4to. *Gass*, s. 277.

(6) *Æpinus* (Joh. Höck, or Hoch, in Greek *αἰπεινός*, died 1533), in a criticism published in 1544, on an exposition of Ps. xvi. by his colleague *Feder* (Höck's critique published Francof. 1644), taught that Christ's descent to hell belonged to His state of humiliation, because His soul suffered the punishments of hell, while His body remained in the grave. He denied that 1 Pet. iii. 18, 19 has a reference to the descensus ad inferos, but was opposed by his colleagues in Hamburg. Flacius defended Höck. The Formula Concordiæ (p. 613) cut short further questions by declaring the article in question to be one, qui neque sensibus, neque ratione nostra comprehendi queat, sola autem fide acceptandus sit. See *Planck*, v. 1, s. 251 ff. *Schröckh*, l.c. s. 541 ff.

§ 268.

The Doctrine of Atonement.

* *Weisse*, M. Lutherus, quid de Consilio Mortis et Resurrectionis Christi senserit, Lips. 1845. [Comp. the works of *Baur* (Versöhnung), *Thomson* (Bampton Lectures), *Oxenham* (The Atonement), u.s.]

As Protestants and Roman Catholics agreed in resting their theology and Christology on the basis of the œcumenical symbols (the Apostles', the Nicene, and the Athanasian Creeds), so they espoused in common the doctrine of atonement as given in Anselm's theory of satisfaction (1), only with this difference, that (in connection with other principles) the Protestants gave the preference to that aspect of this theory presented by Thomas Aquinas, while the Roman Catholics, on the contrary, were favourable (at least in part) to the scheme of Duns Scotus (2). The Protestant theologians, however, further developing the doctrine of Anselm, carried their definitions sharply out on two points. On the one hand, they so extended the idea of vicarious suffering, as to make it include the divine curse (mors æterna) (3), an opinion against which the Roman theologians protested (4). On the other hand, they insisted upon the active obedience of Christ, together with the passive, referring the former to the complete obedience which

He yielded to the law (5). Both opinions were intimately connected with the Protestant doctrine of justification. But while the advocates of orthodox Protestantism carried the doctrine of Anselm to such an extreme in one direction as to weaken it on the other side (6), the adherents of the negative system of *Socinus*, and those of like tendencies, endeavoured by dialectical reasoning to dissolve the whole theory, and to explain away its scriptural basis (7). By this atomistic treatment of the doctrine, the Socinians lost sight of the more profound significance of the death of Jesus, in which they saw only, either the death of a martyr inducing others thus to lay down their lives, or the confirmation of the divine promises, or, in fine, the necessary transition to His resurrection and subsequent apotheosis (8). The *Arminians* endeavoured to take an intermediate position between the Socinians and the ecclesiastical theory propounded by Anselm. The subtle distinction made by *Grotius* between *satisfactio* and *solutio*, and the idea that God, by inflicting death upon Christ, had given in an arbitrary way an example of punishment, were untenable modifications of Anselm's theory. He thus deprived it of its characteristic features, without satisfying the sceptical understanding of the Socinians (9). After Grotius, *Curcellæus* and *Limborch* emphasized the idea of a sacrifice, as set forth in the Old Testament, which the theologians previous to the time of Anselm had generally adopted (10). This theory was introduced into the Arminian works on systematic theology, and approved by the Socinians of the next period (11). The Quakers admitted the orthodox doctrine, that redemption has once been made by the death of Christ, but connected with it the idea of a second redemption, which is realized internally. In accordance with their entire economy of redemption, and the opinions of the mystics in general, they regarded this second reconciliation as the essential redeeming principle (12).

(1) However much Roman Catholics and Protestants differed as to the *causes* and *consequences* of Christ's death (sin

and justification), they were in perfect accordance respecting its object. "*It is the common doctrine of Protestants and Roman Catholics, that the sufferings or merits of Christ possess an infinite objective value.*" *Baur*, s. 344. On this account little was determined concerning this point during the earlier part of the Reformation. "*Melanchthon, even in the later editions of the Loci Theologici, did not treat of the theory of satisfaction in a particular locus, nor did he expressly single it out, but included all that had reference to it in the doctrine of justifying faith. The same may be said with regard to those passages in the Augustana* (Conf. of Augsburg) *and the Apologia which refer to the atoning death of Christ.*" *Baur*, s. 289. Comp. Conf. August. Art. iii. p. 10; Apolog. iii. p. 93: Lex damnat omnes homines, sed Christus, quia sine peccato subiit pœnam peccati, et victima pro nobis factus est, instituit illud jus legis, ne accuset, ne damnet nos qui credant in ipsum, quia credant in ipsum, quia ipse est propitiatio pro eis, propter quam nunc justi reputantur. Yet even *Luther* fell back upon the older representation of a legal strife with the devil, and of his being worsted therein; see his Easter Sermon, 1530; his Commentary on Job, and other passages cited by *Weisse*, l.c. s. 29 f.; yet, on the other hand, he went beyond Anselm, and recognized particularly the idea of satisfaction as inadequate; see *Walch*, xx. s. 989, and compare *Schenkel*, s. 227 ff. (On the relation of Luther's doctrine to that of *Osiander*, see *Weisse*, s. 83 ff.) In *Zwingli*, more than in Luther and Melanchthon, the doctrine of satisfaction in the sense of Anselm is made prominent; yet there are also passages which indicate that he too had got beyond it; see *Schenkel*, s. 245 ff. In fact, "*the strict Anselmic theory of satisfaction does not come right out anywhere in the Reformed system.*" *Schweizer*, ii. s. 389. *Schneckenburger*, l.c.

(2) There were indeed some eminent Roman Catholic writers, among them even *Bellarmine*, who sided with Thomas Aquinas, but (to judge from occasional expressions) it would appear that even with them the scheme of Duns Scotus had in some respects greater authority. Comp. *Baur*, s. 345 with s. 348. A further difference was this, that in the opinion of the Roman Catholics, by the death of Jesus satisfaction was made only for guilt contracted before baptism; while only the

eternal punishment, due to mortal sins committed after baptism, has been remitted; so that Christians have themselves to make satisfaction for temporal punishments. They also asserted that the merits of Christ were supererogatory, while Protestants thought they were equivalent to the penalties to be inflicted upon men. Comp. the passages quoted by *Winer*, s. 77. And lastly, according to Roman Catholics, Christ by His sufferings obtained merit for Himself; this opinion was also adopted by some Calvinistic theologians (*e.g. Piscator*). See *Baur*, s. 349 f. Among the Protestants themselves, the Reformed Church approximated more nearly to the Scotist *acceptilatio* than did the Lutherans. See *Schneckenburger*, l.c.

(3) *Gerhard*, Loci Theologici, xvii. 2, c. 54: Quomodo enim peccata nostra vere in se suscepisset ac perfectam satisfactionem præstitisset, nisi iram Dei individuo nexu cum peccatis conjunctam vere sensisset? Quomodo a maledicto legis nos redemisset, factus pro nobis maledictum, nisi judicium Dei irati persensisset?—Nor did the Heidelb. Catechism restrict the passive obedience of Christ to His sacrifice made on the cross (as Anselm had done), for it expressly states (Qu. 37) that Christ "bore the divine wrath during the whole period of His earthly life." And in Qu. 44 mention is made of His *mental sufferings*, to which the theologians of the Reformed Church, generally speaking, attached greater importance. See *Beckhaus*, l.c. s. 68 f.

(4) *Bellarmine* pronounced this doctrine "a new, unheard-of heresy." *Baur*, s. 348.

(5) This doctrine of obedientia activa was most prominently brought forward in the Formula Concordiæ. On the question whether, and in what manner, it had previously existed, see the Evang. Kirch.-Zeit. 1834, s. 523; and, on the other side, *Baur*, s. 297, note. "*Even the well-read Ch. W. F. Walch observes in his Comment. de Obedient. Christi activa*, p. 30: *Quis primus hujus, formulæ fuerit auctor, certe definire non audeo.*" *Baur*, s. 301. Comp. however, *Weisse*, l.c. s. 52 ff. *Schenkel*, i. s. 267 ff. Form. Conc. p. 684: Cum enim Christus non tantum homo, verum Deus et homo sit in una persona indivisa, tam non fuit legi subjectus, quam non fuit passioni et morti (ratione suæ personæ) obnoxius, quia Dominus legis erat. Eam ob causam ipsius obedientia (non ea tantum, qua Patri

paruit in tota sua passione et morte, verum etiam, qua nostra causa sponte sese legi subjecit, eamque obedientia illa sua implevit) nobis ad justitiam imputatur, ita ut Deus propter totam obedientiam, quam Christus *agendo et patiendo*, in vita et morte sua, nostra causa Patri suo cœlesti præstitit, peccata nobis remittat, pro bonis et justis nos reputet, et salute æterna donet. P. 686: Propter obedientiam Christi, quam Christus inde a nativitate sua usque ad ignominiosissimam crucis mortem pro nobis Patri suo præstitit, boni et justi pronuntiantur et reputantur. Comp. p. 696. Nor did the earlier Reformed theologians make a distinction between obedientia activa et passiva. *Calvin* comprehends both together; see Inst. ii. 16, 5 ss. See *Baur*, s. 333. On the contrary, the Form. Consens., which was afterwards composed, agreed with the Form. Concordiæ (in opposition to *Georg Karg*, and afterwards to *Piscator*. See § 269), in Art. 15: Spiritus quoque Dei rotundo ore asserit, Christum sanctissima sua vita legi et justitiæ divinæ pro nobis satisfecisse, et pretium illud, quo emti sumus Deo, non in passionibus duntaxat, sed tota ejus vita legi conformata collocat. Comp. *Thomasius*, Dogmatis de Obedientia activa Historia, Erlang. 1846, 2 vols. 4to.

(6) It carried the doctrine to an extreme, by annexing the idea of divine wrath, and of the pains of hell; it weakened it by adding the obedientia activa, since the redeeming element was then no longer exclusively connected with the pouring out of the blood, and the agony endured, but diffused through the whole life, and only concentrated in the sacrificial death.

(7) *Sebastian Frank* and *Thamer* had preceded in this path; see *Schenkel*, i. s. 254 ff. But *Occhino* tries more particularly, in his Dialogues (Bas. 1463), to transform the objective satisfaction-theory of the Church into an act of subjective reflection, whereby man comes to see that God is disposed to forgive him, when he is penitent; see *Schenkel*, ii. s. 265 ff. To these forerunners *F. Socinus* attaches himself in his Prælect. Theol. (see *Baur*, s. 371 ff. *Fock*, s. 615 ff.). He endeavours to show the contradictory nature of the ideas of satisfactio and remissio peccatorum. Where *satisfaction* has been made, forgiveness is no longer needed; and where sin must be remitted, no satisfaction has been made (for to forgive implies that grace takes the place of justice). A debt is either remitted or

claimed. If another make the payment, it has the same value as if it had been paid by the debtor himself, and a gift is out of the question. Nor can punishment be compared to debt. The former is something quite personal, which cannot be transferred from one person to another. The sufferings of the innocent could not satisfy the requirements of divine justice, which demanded the punishment of the guilty. But mercy could pardon without inflicting punishment. And lastly, what Christ has done and suffered for us is no true equivalent. Not only has the whole human race deserved eternal death, but *every* sinner for himself deserves the same penalty. But Christ did not die eternal death, and His temporal death was only one (not several deaths). Further, the sufferings and death of Christ had not the character of punishment, but formed His transition to glory. Nor can we speak of active obedience, because the man Christ owed it to God for Himself; besides, one man could render obedience only for one man, but not one man for all.—*Socinus* also pointed out the (possible) immoral consequences of the Protestant doctrine of justification (as did all its opponents).—In respect to the interpretation of Scripture, there was no need here of being as arbitrary as in the Christology. Comp. *Baur*, s. 391. *Fock*, s. 631 ff. "It can hardly be denied that the Socinians, in their attack upon the doctrine of satisfaction, did all that was possible from their standpoint. The sharp, intellectual dialectics of Socinianism struck so precisely at the weak points of the Church doctrine, and exposed its defects so clearly, that it was difficult, if not impossible, for the latter to ward off with success this superior opponent." Ibid. s. 635.

(8) *Socinus* defined the object of Christ's death *positively* as follows: 1. *The death of Christ was an example set before men for their imitation.* Christ. Relig. Inst. (Biblioth. Fratr. Polon. t. i. p. 667): Christus suorum fidelium servator est, primum, quia sui ipsius exemplo illos ad viam salutis, quam ingressi jam sunt, perpetuo tenendam movet atque inducit. . . . Quomodo vero suo exemplo potuisset Christus movere atque inducere suos fideles ad singularem illam probitatem et innocentiam perpetuo retinendam, sine qua servari nequeunt, nisi ipse prior cruentam mortem, quæ illam facile comitatur, gustasset? Men by imitating this example will also be delivered from sin. Præl.

Theol. p. 591: Tollit peccata Christus, quia ad pœnitentiam agendam, qua peccata delentur, cœlestibus iisque amplissimis promissis omnes allicit et movere potens est. . . . Tollit . . . peccata, quia vitæ suæ innocentissimæ exemplo omnes, qui deploratæ spei non fuerint, ad justitiæ et sanctitatis studium, peccatis relictis, amplectendum, facillime adducit. The deliverance from sin is brought about in a psychologico-moral way. 2. *It was the confirmation of the promises made by God:* De Jesu Christo Servatore, p. 1, c. 3 (Bibl. t. ii. p. 127): Mortuus igitur est Christus, ut novum et æternum Dei fœdus, cujus ipse mediator fuerat, stabiliret ac conservaret. Et adeo hac ratione divina promissa confirmavit, ut Deum ipsum quodammodo ad ea nobis præstanda devinxerit, et sanguis ejus assidue ad patrem clamat, ut promissorum suorum, quæ ipse Christus nobis illius nomine annunciavit, pro quibus confirmandis suum ipsius sanguinem fundere non recusavit, meminisse velit.—Comp. Cat. Racov. Qu. 383. With this is connected the assurance of the forgiveness of sins: De Christo Serv. c. 13: Morte Christi, seu ejus supplicio peracto, nemo est, qui Deum nos suprema caritate amplexum non agnoscat, eum erga nos placatissimum non videat, et jam sibi universa delicta condonata esse, pro certo habeat. 3. *The necessary means preparatory to His resurrection, by which He entered into glory.* Cat. Racov. p. 265 (see *Winer*, s. 74): . . . Deinde (mortuus est), quod per mortem pervenerit ad resurrectionem, ex qua maxima oritur divinæ voluntatis confirmatio deque nostra resurrectione et vitæ æternæ adeptione certissima persuasio.—With this is connected the feeling of compassion which Christ, in His state of exaltation, has toward men, on account of which He delivers them from death, Christ. Relig. Instit. p. 667, De Jesu Chr. Serv. p. 133. See *Baur*, s. 410: "*Inasmuch as Christ employs the power granted to Him by God in forgiving men their sins, and making them partakers of eternal life, the Socinians admit Him to be high priest; but as Christ exercises His functions of high priest in heaven alone, His priestly office does not essentially differ from the kingly.*" Comp. the passages quoted from the symbolical books of the Socinians by *Winer*, s. 74 f.; *Flatt*, Beiträge zur christlichen Dogmatik und Moral, Tüb. 1792; and *Schneckenburger*, s. 51.

(9) *Grotius*, in his treatise, Defensio Fidei Catholicæ de

Satisfactione Christi, 1617 (extracts by *Joach. Lange*, 1730), combated the views of Socinus, and argued from the juridical proposition (c. 2): Punire non est actus competens parti offensæ quâ tali. God may indeed be considered as the offended party, but in inflicting punishments He does not punish quâ pars offensa (sicut jurisconsultus canit non quâ jurisconsultus, sed quâ musicus). The right of punishing belongs to God as the Sovereign of the universe, independently of any offence which may have been given to Him. Punishment has a political design (ordinis nimirum conservationem et exemplum); for justice is not manifested in avenging injuries, or compelling debtors to pay their debts (which he might voluntarily remit), but in punishing the wicked. That in certain cases the punishment falls upon the innocent, proves nothing; similar instances might be adduced from the history of nations, *e.g.* the decimating of the Roman legions! Nihil ergo iniquitatis in eo est, quod Deus, cujus est summa potestas ad omnia per se non injusta, nulli ipse legi obnoxius, cruciatibus et morte Christi uti voluit ad statuendum exemplum grave adversus culpas immensas nostrum omnium, quibus Christus erat conjunctissimus natura, regno, vadimonio (c. 4, towards the end). He endeavoured to meet the objection made by Socinus, by making a distinction between satisfactio and solutio. The solutio, indeed, excludes the remissio peccatorum, because matters having been settled between creditor and debtor, no further demand can be made upon the latter. But the satisfactio (in the sense applied to it by Grotius) does not exclude the possibility of a remissio (c. 6, 6, p. 78).—Comp. *Luden*, Hugo Grotius, s. 100 ff. Evangelische Kirchenzeitung, 1834, Nr. 66. *Seisen* (see above, § 180), p. 90 ss.—In the formal judicial aspect, the theory of Grotius resembled that of Anselm, but was not so profound, either from the theological or juridical point of view. It was based upon political rather than strictly juridical premisses, and seemed to ascribe to God a despotic character. It could not satisfy either the feelings or the reason of Christians, while the theory of Anselm accomplished the former, and that of the Socinians the latter, though both were one-sided and imperfect. Grotius, indeed, not only rejected the idea of "Acceptilation," but also unjustly charged Socinus with holding it; nevertheless, "*there is no theory to*

which the idea of acceptilation could be applied with greater propriety than to that of Grotius." (*Baur*, s. 428.) "*Grotius, as well as Socinus, attached principal importance to the moral impression which the death of Christ is calculated to produce, with this difference only, that Grotius takes this moral principle negatively, Socinus positively; for, in the opinion of Grotius, the moral effect of Christ's death consists in the exhibition of the punishment due to sin; according to Socinus, in the moral courage which Christ manifested in His death.*" (*Baur*, s. 431 f.) Nor was the theory of Grotius in accordance with the (orthodox) doctrine concerning the nature of Christ, since the effect spoken of by Grotius might have been produced by another than a God-man; comp. ibid. s. 433.—The weak points of this theory were exposed by the Socinian *Crell*, in his Responsio ad librum Hug. Grotii, quem de satisfactione Christi adv. Faustum Socinum Senensem scripsit, 1623 (in Bibl. Fratr. Polon. t. v. p. 1 ss.). On this treatise, and the further progress of the controversy, see *Baur*, s. 438 ff.

(10) *Curcellæus*, Rel. Christ. Instit. v. 19. 15 ss., advanced the same arguments against the theory of Anselm which Socinus had made use of, but laid greater stress upon the idea of *sacrifice:* Non ergo, ut vulgo putant, satisfecit Christus patiendo omnes pœnas, quas peccatis nostris merueramus: nam primo istud ad sacrificii rationem non pertinet, sacrificia enim non sunt solutiones debitorum; secundo Christus non est passus mortem æternam, quæ erat pœna peccato debita, nam paucis tantum horis in cruce pependit et tertia die resurrexit. Imo etiamsi mortem æternam pertulisset, non videtur satisfacere potuisse pro omnibus totius mundi peccatis; hæc enim fuisset tantum una mors, quæ omnibus mortibus, quas singuli pro suis peccatis meruerant, non æquivaluisset. *Limborch* also rested his argumentation mainly upon the idea of sacrifice (Apol. Thes. 3. 22, 5), which, according to his definition, is not plenaria satisfactio pro peccatis, but only the condition of the gratuita peccati remissio. . . . Voluntas divina in unica hac victima acquievit. Comp. *Baur*, s. 442 ff.

(11) See *Baur*, s. 451, Anm.

(12) *Barclay*, Apol. Thes. vii. 2 (in *Winer*, s. 76; *Baur*, s. 467 ff.). On the other mystics, *Schwenkfeld*, *Weigel*, *Böhm*, see *Baur*, s. 459 ff., and comp. the sections on justification and sanctification.

§ 269.

Differences within the Lutheran and Reformed Churches, and further Doctrinal Development.

Osiander, a Lutheran theologian, propounded a theory respecting the sufferings of Christ, in connection with his views of the relation in which justification stands to sanctification. In his opinion, it was only the *divine* nature of our Lord which became our righteousness (1); while, according to the orthodox doctrine, Christ suffered death on our account in His character as God-man. On the other hand, *Stancarus* (2) asserted that it was only the *human* nature of the Redeemer which suffered. But this view was rejected by the orthodox theologians of all the three principal Confessions. Among the Reformed, *Johann Piscator* of Herborn (after the example of *Georg Karg*, a Lutheran clergyman), as well as *John Cameron* of Saumur, combated the doctrine of an obedientia activa, maintaining that Christ owed active obedience for Himself to God (3). In opposition to these views, as well as to those of the sects, both Lutheran and Calvinistic divines firmly established and formally developed the doctrine of satisfaction. In works on systematic theology, it took its place in Christology, along with the three offices of Christ (viz. as His priestly office); with justification in the Lutheran system as the *causa meritoria* of salvation; in the Reformed, as the *causa instrumentalis* (4).

(1) Conf. M. 3, p. 93: Diserte et clare respondeo, quod sec. divinam suam naturam sit nostra justitia, et non sec. humanam naturam, quamvis hanc divinam justitiam extra ejus humanam naturam non possumus invenire, consequi, aut apprehendere; verum cum ipse per fidem in nobis habitat, tum affert suam justitiam, quæ est ejus divina natura, secum in nos, quæ deinde nobis etiam imputatur ac si esset nostra propria, immo et donatur nobis manatque ex ipsius humana natura, tanquam ex capite, etiam in nos, tanquam ipsius membra. See *Schenkel*,

i. s. 300 ff., 355 ff. On the relation in which his doctrine stood to some earlier opinions respecting Christ's mystical body, see *Baur*, s. 327 f. On similar views entertained by *Calvin*, who also violently opposed Osiander, see *Baur*, i. s. 331 ff.; *Schenkel*, ii. s. 369. (Among the opponents of Osiander, *Mörlin* took the rudest view of redemption, exhibiting it naively in a dramatic way; *Schenkel*, ii. s. 367.)

(2) *Franciscus Stancarus* of Mantua (died 1574, in Poland). His theory, which was represented as Nestorianism, was condemned by both Protestants (Form. Concord.) and Roman Catholics (*Bellarmine*, see *Baur*, s. 347). *Calvin* also opposed him. *Wigand*, De Stancarismo et Osiandrismo, 1585, 4to. *Schlüsselburg*, Cat. Hæret. lib. ix.

(3) *Joh. Piscator*, a Calvinistic theologian of Herborn, lived towards the close of the sixteenth and commencement of the seventeenth century; see *Schweizer*, Centraldogmen, ii. s. 17. —*Karg* (Parsimonius) gave publicity to his views, A.D. 1563, but renounced them 1570. Comp. *Walch*, Einl. in die Religionsstr. d. evang.-luther. Kirche, Thl. iv. s. 360 ff. *Baur*, s. 352 ff. *Schröckh*, v. s. 358. *Schweizer*, ii. s. 16. On *Cameron*, see ibid. s. 235 ff.

(4) Compare the compendiums of systematic theology. *De Wette*, s. 156 ff. *Schneckenburger*, l.c. *Schweizer*, Glaubenslehre der ref. Kirche, ii. s. 389.

The theory of Anselm made the appearance of Christ on earth dependent upon the existence of sin; according to *Osiander* and the *Socinians*, he would have manifested Himself, though there had been no sin in the world. *Osiander* investigated this subject very fully in a separate treatise (which has now become rare): An Filius Dei fuerit incarnandus, si peccatum non introivisset in mundum? Königsb. 1550. Comp. *Schlüsselburg*, Cat. Hær. lib. vi. p. 48 ss.; *Baur*, s. 329. On the Socinians, see *Fock*, s. 506 f.

§ 270.

Doctrine of Baptism.

J. W. Höfling, Das Sacrament der Taufe, Erlangen 1846. [*E. B. Pusey*, in Tracts for the Times, No. 67, 3d ed. 1840. *W. Goode*, Doctrine of the Church of England as to the effects of Baptism in the case of Infants, Lond. 1849, 2d ed. 1850. *J. B. Mozley*, The Prim. Doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration, Lond. 1856. *The same*, Review of the Baptismal Controversy, Lond. 1862.]

Among the doctrines in which Roman Catholics and Protestants preserved a certain agreement, in opposition to the minor religious sects, was that respecting baptism (1). For although the baptismal ritual itself was different with the Roman Catholics, Lutherans, and Reformed (2),—and equal differences of opinion obtained respecting the effects of baptism, as regards original sin, and the fate of those children who die unbaptized (3), and as to the capacity of faith in the baptized and the degree of baptismal grace (4),—yet Protestants and Catholics entertained essentially the same view of the *nature of baptism*, asserting—1. Its necessity in general, against the Quakers (5); 2. Its sacramental character, in opposition to the Socinians (6); and chiefly, 3. The necessity of infant baptism, in opposition to the Anabaptists (Mennonites) (7). And lastly, the Roman Catholics, in accordance with their view of the baptism of heretics, were compelled to acknowledge the validity of Protestant baptism; while, on the other hand, the Protestants always respected Roman baptism as a Christian ordinance, and never thought of rebaptizing those who passed over to their Confessions (8).

(1) "*Of all the sacraments, that of baptism is the one respecting which Roman Catholics could always unite most easily with Protestants, and would have had the least necessity for framing particular canons, in order to keep up any difference in respect to points of secondary importance.*" *Marheinecke*, Symbolik, i. s. 149. The Reformers also declared that of all the sacraments, that of baptism was least corrupted, and that this ordinance had more than any other been preserved from the addition of foreign usages, *Lutheri* Opp. Lat., Jen. t. ii. p. 284 (in *Marheinecke*, l.c.).

(2) On the use of the chrisma (ointment), of salt, and the lactis et mellis degustatio, together with other ceremonies practised by Roman Catholics, the exorcism used by Lutherans, etc., as well as on the usages of the Greek Church, see the works on Archæology. "As regards the water," said *Zwingli* (Vom Touf: Werke, ii. s. 299), "it should be taken good, fresh, and pure; for as John baptized in the river

Jordan, we ought not to allow the bishops to attach so much importance to the salt." Yet there still remained in the Protestant Church many superstitions in respect to the baptismal water. Comp. *Gerhard*, Loci Theol. xxi. c. 8, § 170.

(3) Comp. § 246. According to the Roman Catholic doctrine, original sin being removed by baptism, all that remains in the baptized is the concupiscentia, which is lex fomitis, but not sin; in the opinion of the Protestants, original sin still remains in the baptized (as they regarded concupiscence itself as sinful), but is no longer imputed. Comp. Conc. Trid., Sess. v. 5; and on the other side, Apol. Aug. p. 56 (for further passages, see *Winer*, s. 64), and especially *Calvin*, Institut. iv. c. 15, § 10 ss. On the condemnation of unbaptized children, see *Winer*, s. 131 ff.

(4) While the Lutherans, after the example of Luther (see *Schenkel*, i. s. 440 ff.), assumed an actual *faith* on the part of the children, and thus viewed the baptismal grace in an objective way; the Reformed contented themselves with the statement, that children by baptism were received into covenant with God, even though there was as yet no actual faith on their part. Compare on the Lutheran side, *Gerhard*, Loci Theol. xxi. c. 8, § 222: Quamvis τεκμήρια et effectus fidei in infantibus non ita in oculos et sensus externos incurrant, ut fidei in adultis, non tamen ob id omnes fidei fructus in infantibus sunt negandi, cum Scriptura ipsis tribuat Dei laudem (Ps. viii. 3), Dei cognitionem (1 John ii. 14), victoriam mundi (c. v. 4), quos esse fidei fructus et bona opera nemo inficias iverit. . . . Arbor bona in media hieme non destituitur proprietate bonos fructus proferendi, quamvis exterius id non appareat: et nos fidem infantibus ex eo negabimus, quod externos ejusdem fructus non proferant? Ut in seminibus et surculis arborum res se habet, quamquam non ferunt fructus, tamen inest eis vis et natura, ut fructus suo tempore producant: sic infantum fides ἐνέργειαν exteriorem suo tempore exserit et fert fructus Deo placentes.—On the other hand, the Reformed took the ground, *e.g. Musculus*, p. 336: Infantulos habere fidem, non probare possumus, nec satis est occultam habere fidem, sed fidei professio requiritur, quæ certo illis tribui non potest. *Vitringa*, Aphorism. p. 250: Baptizandi sunt fidelium infantes, quia justa præsumtio est, quod a

Spiritu Sancto ut hæreditas Christi occupati sint et suo tempore vere sint crediturі. Comp. *Schweizer*, Glaubenslehre der reform. Kirche, ii. s. 620.

(5) Comp. § 258, note 7, in the sacraments. Baptism, according to the doctrine of the Reformed, is certainly not necessary in the sense, that if outward circumstances render it impossible to receive it, the unbaptized person thereby suffers a disadvantage. Comp. *Zwingli* (Vom Touf: Werke, ii. s. 242), who refers to the thief on the cross, who went to Paradise without baptism: "Hence we are taught that water-baptism is a ceremonial sign with which salvation is not connected." And *Calvin*, Instit. iv. 16, § 26: Clara est Domini promissio: Quicunque in Filium credidit, non visurum mortem nec in judicium venturum, sed transiisse a morte ad vitam (Jno. v. 24): nondum baptizatum nullibi damnasse comperitur. Quod in eam a me partem accipi nolo, perinde ac si baptismum contemni impune posse innuerem (quo contemptu violatum iri Domini fœdus affirmo: tantum abest, ut excusare sustineam): tantum evincere sufficit, non esse adeo necessarium, ut periisse protinus existimetur, cui ejus obtinendi adempta fuerit facultas.

(6) *Zwingli* may herein be considered as the forerunner of the Socinians, so far as this, that his statements on baptism are much behind the later definitions of the Reformed Church, and are essentially different from those of Luther. In his Confess. ad Carolum V., baptism is viewed as having only the significance of reception into the Church: Non quod baptismus rem præstet, sed ut rem prius præstitam multitudini testeter. *Zwingli*, Vom Touf (Werke, ii. 1, s. 301): "No element or external thing in this world can purify the soul, but the purification of the soul is only of the grace of God. So it follows, that baptism cannot wash away any sin. As it cannot wash sin away, and yet has been appointed of God, it must be a *sign of dedication* of the people of God, and *nothing at all else*." Comp. s. 238 ff. So, too, the Socinians view baptism as merely a rite of consecration. It has not an effective, but only a declarative significance. *F. Socinus*, De Baptismo Aquæ Disput. (in Bibl. Fratrum Polon. i. p. 709 ss.) p. 720: In nomine Jesu Christi aqua baptizari nihil aliud est, quam publice Christo nomen dare, ejusque fidem, quæ in

corde latet, palam testari ac profiteri, ita ut non Christianum ulla ex parte baptismus *efficiat*, sed *indicet* atque declarat. Comp. the symbols in *Winer*, s. 128, and *Fock*, s. 582 ff. Similiar views were entertained by the Arminians and Mennonites, who regarded baptism as a symbolical communication of grace, ibid. s. 129. *Luther* expressed himself very differently in his Postille, iii. 34 (*Walch*, xii. s. 714): "And thus the *blood of Christ* is so intimately mingled with the water of baptism, that we should neither regard it as merely clean water, but look upon it as water beautifully coloured and reddened with the precious rose-coloured blood of our dear Saviour Christ." (The circumstance of water and blood flowing out of Christ's side, he referred to baptism; others, to the Lord's Supper.) Comp. also his Catech. Major: "Perceive ye now that (the water of) baptism is very different from all other kinds of water, not on account of its nature, but because something nobler has been added, for God Himself has added His honour, power, and might. Therefore it is not only natural water, but divine, heavenly, holy, and blessed water, and what other praise may be bestowed upon it, all on account of the Word, which is a holy, heavenly Word, which cannot be too highly spoken of." *John Gerhard*, however (Loci Theol. xxi. c. 7, § 122), speaks against a merely physical (magical) union of divine grace with the water: Nec dicimus, quod aquæ vis regenerandi tamquam subjecto φυσικῶς inhæreat, aut quod naturali quacunque ratione et vinculo quodam insolubili gratia Spiritus Sancti ei sit adligata, sed sacramentali mysterio vim illam huic sacramento ex ordinatione divina ὀργανικῶς et ὑπερφυσικῶς ad salutem credentium conjunctam esse dicimus.[1]

(7) The Anabaptists, like the Reformers, rested their opinion on the formal principle of Scripture. Their assertion, that infant baptism was not commanded in Scripture, was combated by the Reformers, who in support of their opinion appealed to

[1] *Osiander* interprets the significance of the *water* in a peculiar way. It is to him a symbol of the law. As the word of the law discloses to man the *wrath* of God, so too the water. Man's body trembles and shivers when he comes to the water, as in his soul he is terrified and made to tremble by the law. But as the law does not destroy man, so baptism is not administered to drown man; but he is drawn out of the water and lives (Rom. vi. 3, 7). See *Heberle* in Studien und Kritiken, 1844, s. 408.

Mark x. 15; 1 Cor. xvi. 15; Acts xvi. 15; but these passages do not hold good. See *Zwingli's* work, "Vom Touf, vom Widertouf, und vom Kindertouf" (edit. of *Schulthess*, ii. 2, s. 230), which may be compared with his Latin treatise: "In Catabaptistarum Strophas Elenchus." (Zwingli made a distinction between the baptism of the Spirit and baptism by water. The more he regarded the latter as an external rite, the less he would hesitate to administer it to infants.) He, as well as Calvin and the Reformed in general, compared infant baptism to the analogous rite of *circumcision.* *Zwingli*, l.c. s. 297: "Circumcision was a sign of faith (Rom. iv. 11), and applied to children. Now we have baptism instead of circumcision; therefore it ought also to be administered to children. They (the Anabaptists) cannot well digest the syllogism, because it is so strongly supported by the Word of God." Comp. *Calvin*, Inst. iv. 15 s. (where, however, the proofs hardly all hold good). For the symbolical books of the Roman Catholic, Lutheran, and Reformed Churches, see *Winer*, s. 130. *Luther's* Catech. Major, p. 544: Puerorum baptismum Christo placere et gratum esse, suo ipsius opere abunde ostenditur, nempe quod Deus illorum non paucos sanctificat, eosdemque Spiritu Sancto impertivit, qui statim a bis partu infantes baptizati sunt. Sunt etiam hodie non parum multi, quos certis indiciis animadvertimus Spiritum Sanctum habere, cum doctrinæ eorum, tum etiam vitæ nomine; sicut et nobis gratia Dei datum et concessum est, nosse Scripturas interpretari, et Christum cognoscere, quod citra Spiritum Sanctum nullo modo fieri posse, nemo dubitat. At si puerorum baptismus Christo non probaretur: nulli horum Spiritum Sanctum, aut ne particulam quidem ejus impertiret, atque ut summatim, quod sentio, eloquar, per tot sæcula quæ ad hunc usque diem elapsa sunt, nullus hominum christianus perhibendus esse. Quoniam vero Deus baptismum sui Sancti Spiritus donatione confirmat, id quod in non Patribus . . . non obscuris argumentis intelligitur, *neque sancta christianorum ecclesia usque ad consummationem sæculi interibit:* fateri coguntur, Deo baptismum non displicere. Neque enim sibi ipse potest esse contrarius, aut mendaciis et nequitiæ suffragari, neque huic promovendæ gratiam suam ac Spiritum suum impertire. Et hæc fere optima et firmissima est pro simplicibus et indoctis com-

probatio. Neque enim hunc articulum: Credo ecclesiam catholicam, communionem sanctorum, etc., nobis eripient aut subvertent unquam. For the views of the later Lutheran and Reformed theologians (concerning the faith of infants, according to Matt. xviii. 6, and the responsibility of the godparents), see *De Wette*, s. 179 f.—[In the form of the Church of England for the baptism of infants, it is said, "*This infant* must also faithfully, for *his* part, promise by you that are his sureties (viz. the godfathers and godmothers), until he come of age to take it upon himself, that he will renounce the devil and all his works," etc. In the Westminster Conf. (ch. 28), baptism is declared to be "not only for the solemn admission of the party baptized into the visible church, but also to be unto him a sign and seal of the covenant of grace, of his ingrafting into Christ, of regeneration, of remission of sins," etc. 6. "The efficacy of baptism is not tied to the moment of time wherein it is administered; yet, notwithstanding, by the right use of *this* ordinance, the grace promised is not only offered, but really exhibited and conferred, by the Holy Ghost, to such (whether of age or infants) as the grace belongeth unto, according to the counsel of God's own will, in His appointed time."] The *Socinians* and *Arminians* approved of infant baptism, but did not think it necessary. Comp. *Winer*, s. 132. Even from the custom of infant baptism, which he adopts, *Socinus* argues against the Church doctrine, that regeneration is connected with it, since infants cannot be regenerated: Tit. iii. 5, he says, refers not to baptism with water, but to spiritual renovation: Cat. Racov., Qu. 348 s. *Fock*, s. 583.—*Labadie* and his followers, in accordance with their other principles, not only rejected infant baptism as such, but in general the baptism of every unregenerate person, whether young or old. See *Arnold*, Kirchen- und Ketzergesch. Thl. ii. B. xvii. c. 21, § 17. *Göbel*, l.c. s. 240.

(8) Comp. *Winer*, s. 133, Anm. 1. It was only some fanatical priests, at the time of the Reformation, who in this respect did not act in accordance with the principles of their own Church. The Mennonites at first rebaptized those who joined them, but afterwards discontinued this usage. Nor did the followers of *Labadie* rebaptize those who had been

baptized in their infancy. (*Arnold*, l.c.) Some of the fanatical sects, however, continued to repeat the act of baptism.

In respect to those who could rightfully administer baptism, all the communions that had a regular order of priests or teachers, assigned baptism to them. Cat. Rom., Qu. 18. Conf. Helv. c. 20.

Jealous as is the Roman Catholic Church in other respects as to the rights of the priestly order, it here concedes an exception, because she assumes the absolute necessity of infant baptism. In the absence of the priest, in cases of extreme necessity, laymen, and if there be no male, then women (nurses) may perform the rite: Cat. Rom., Qu. 19. The Reformed Church declares against this in the most definite manner. Conf. Helv. c. 20: Docemus baptismum in ecclesia non administrari debere a mulierculis vel obstetricibus. Paulus enim removit mulierculas ab officiis ecclesiasticis. Baptismus autem pertinet ad officia ecclesiastica. In practice the Zwinglian Reformed Church is farthest from the Catholic, denying not only the so-called baptism in cases of necessity, but also the baptism in emergency (*Jähtaufe*), which is customary in the Lutheran Church, and in the less strict Reformed Churches. The same holds of baptism in the house. [The Eng. Presbyterians forbid baptism by private persons, but conceded in certain cases that it might be administered in private houses.]

§ 271.

Eschatology.

And lastly, Protestants and Roman Catholics were in almost perfect accordance as to the doctrine of the last things (1) (with the exception of the doctrine concerning purgatory, § 261). The minor sects also adopted, in the main, the same views respecting the second advent of Christ to judge the world, and the resurrection of the body. As regards the state of the blessed and the lost, the opinions of the different denominations were modified in various ways by their respective creeds (2), but these differences were not introduced into their symbolical books (3). *Calvin* opposed the theory called Psychopannychy, revived by some Swiss Anabaptists (4); the Second Confessio Helvetica expressly rejected the idea that departed spirits reappear on earth (5). The fanatical notions of the Anabaptists, concerning the restitution of all things, and Millenarianism, were rejected by the Protestants (6). Nevertheless several Protestant writers, on various occasions,

revived Millenarian opinions, which were also encouraged by the mystics (7). *Wilhelm Petersen* and his wife (8), misunderstanding *Spener's* doctrine on better times to come, and the realization of God's kingdom on earth (9), announced the speedy approach of the Millennial reign.

(1) Protestant theologians generally enumerate the following four particulars as constituting what are called the last things: mors, resurrectio, extremum judicium, and consummatio mundi; some, however, adopt other modes of reckoning. Comp. *De Wette*, s. 207.

(2) On the views respecting heaven, as held, *e.g.*, by Lutherans and Reformed, see *Schneckenburger*, Ueber den doppelten Stand Christi, s. 115.

(3) Conf. Aug., Art. 17 (p. 14): Item docent, quod Christus apparebit in consummatione mundi ad judicandum et mortuos omnes resuscitabit; piis et *electis* dabit vitam æternam et perpetua gaudia, impios autem homines ac diabolos condemnabit, ut sine fine crucientur (the same doctrine is set forth in the other symbolical books).—At a later period theologians endeavoured (in the spirit of the scholastics) to define the distinction between the happiness which the soul will enjoy *without* the body, and that of which it will partake after the resurrection of the body. The general judgment at the end of the world was also distinguished from the judicium extremum particulare et occultum, which takes place after the death of each individual.

(4) He wrote: Traité par le quel est prouvé, que les âmes veillent et vivent après qu'elles sont sorties des corps, Orléans, 1534. It was also translated into Latin under the title: Psychopannychia, quo refellitur eorum error, qui animos post mortem usque ad ultimum judicium dormire putant, Par. 1534. Comp. *Henry's* Calvin, i. s. 63 ff.—The question, started by some of the Fathers, whether the soul of itself possesses immortality (above, § 58), was also revived in the seventeenth century. *Henry Dodwell*, a learned high-church theologian of the Church of England (in order to exalt the doctrine of baptismal grace), asserted that the soul is itself mortal, but rendered immortal by becoming connected with the Divine Spirit in baptism. Only the Episcopal Church enjoys the true possession of this baptismal grace! This

assertion called forth several replies. The controversy lasted principally from the year 1706 to 1708. See *Lechler*, Geschichte des englischen Deismus, s. 211 ff. [*Henry Dodwell*, born 1641, died 1711, Camden Prof. at Oxford 1688, ejected for refusing the oath to William and Mary. His work was entitled: Epistolary Discourse, proving from the Scriptures and first Fathers that the soul is a principle naturally mortal, but immortalized actually by the pleasure of God, to punishment, or to reward, by its union with the divine baptismal Spirit, Lond. 1706. Among the replies were works by *Samuel Clarke*, A Letter to Mr. Dodwell (Works, iii.); *Richard Baxter*, and *Daniel Whitby*.] Comp. *Baumgarten*, Geschichte der Religionsparteien, p. 71.

(5) Art. 26 (in reference to the doctrine of purgatory): Jam quod traditur de spiritibus vel animabus mortuorum apparentibus aliquando viventibus, et petentibus ab eis officia, quibus liberentur, deputamus apparitiones eas inter ludibria, artes, et deceptiones diaboli, qui, ut potest se transfigurare in angelum lucis, ita satagit fidem veram vel evertere, vel in dubium revocare. (Deut. xviii. 10, 11; Luc. xvi. 31.)

(6) Conf. Aug. l.c.: Damnant Anabaptistas, qui sentiunt, hominibus damnatis ac diabolis finem pœnarum futurum esse. Damnant et alios, qui nunc spargunt judaïcas opiniones, quod ante resurrectionem mortuorum pii regnum mundi occupaturi sint, ubique oppressis impiis.

(7) *Michaël Stiefel, Valentin Weigel, Jacob Böhm, Felgenhauer, Drabicius, Quirinus Kuhlmann*, etc. Comp. *Corrodi*, Geschichte des Chiliasmus, and *Adelung*, Geschichte der menschlichen Narrheit. On the announcement of the day of judgment by M. Stiefel, comp. the letter of *J. P. Weller* to *J. Brisman* (in *Burkhardt*, Luthers Briefwechsel, s. 216).

(8) *Joh. Wilhelm Petersen* (from the year 1688 superintendent in Lüneburg, deposed 1692, and died 1727, on his estate of Thymern, near Zerbst) published from 1700–1710 his Mysterium Apocatastaseos, in which the common millenarian doctrine (of a double resurrection, and a millennial kingdom on earth) was connected with Origen's notion of the restitution of all things.[1] His wife, *Johanna Eleonora von Merlau*, agreed

[1] He also held the idea of Christ's heavenly humanity, referred to in § 266, note 7.

with him in all points; both boasted of having received particular revelations from God. See Petersen's Autobiography, 1717. *Corrodi*, iii. 2, s. 133 ff. *Schröckh*, Kirchengesch. nach der Reformat. viii. s. 302 ff.

(9) *Spener*, firmly believing in the final victory of Christianity, entertained "*a hope of better times.*" Before the last judgment the Jews will be converted, and the Papacy overthrown. But in his opinion this glorious state does not abrogate the kingdom of grace, nor will it manifest itself in a worldly manner. Spener did not venture to determine anything respecting the exact period of time (the period of a thousand years). "*But his opponents found no difficulty in drawing invidious inferences from the moderate hopes of Spener.*" *Schröckh*, viii. s. 282.—The views of *Joachim Lange*, concerning the Apocalypse, were more literal than those of his master; see *Corrodi*, iii. 1, s. 108 ff.

FIFTH PERIOD.

FROM THE YEAR 1720 TO THE PRESENT DAY.

THE AGE OF CRITICISM, OF SPECULATION, AND OF THE ANTAGONISMS BETWEEN FAITH AND KNOWLEDGE, PHILOSOPHY AND CHRISTIANITY, REASON AND REVELATION, AND OF ATTEMPTS TO RECONCILE THESE ANTAGONISMS.

A.—GENERAL HISTORY OF DOCTRINES DURING THE FIFTH PERIOD.

§ 272.

Introduction.

J. A. Von Einem, Versuch einer Geschichte des 18 Jahrhunderts, Leipz. 1776 ff. *Schlegel*, Kg. des 18 Jahrh., Heilbr. 1784 ff., 2 vols., continued by *Fraas*. *Schlosser*, Gesch. des 18 Jahrhunderts, Heidelb. 1836 ff., 2 vols. to 1763. [5 vols. to 1797; 3d ed. 1843; transl., Lond. 6 vols. 1846.] *J. K. L. Gieseler*, Kirchengesch. d. neusten Zeit, von 1814 bis auf die Gegenwart, Bonn 1845 [in Eng. For. Theol. Lib.]. *Hagenbach*, Kirchengesch. des 18ten und 19ten Jahrh. 2 vols. 1848. *Neudecker*, Geschichte des evang. Protest. in Deutschland, 2 Thle. Lpz. 1845. Comp. the literature in *Hase's* Kg. before § 419, and in *Niedner*, Kg. s. 795. **F. C. Baur*, Kg. des 19 Jahrhunderts, Tüb. 1862. *C. G. Gervinus*, Geschichte des 19 Jahrh. 4 vols. 1859. [*Abbey and Overton*, The English Church in the Eighteenth Century, London 1878.]

J. K. L. Gieseler, Rückblick auf die theologische und kirchliche Entwicklung der letzten 50 Jahre, Gött. 1837 (Kritische Prediger-Bibliothek, xviii. 5, s. 908 ff.). On the other side: *Tholuck*, Abriss und Geschichte der Umwälzung, welche seit 1750 auf dem Gebiet der Theologie in Deutschland stattgefunden, in the Berliner evang. Kirchenzeitung, Dec. 1838 (see

his Vermischte Schriften, vol. 2). [*E. B. Pusey*, An Historical Inquiry into the Probable Causes of the Rationalistic Character lately predominant in the Theology of Germany. To which is prefixed a letter from *Prof. Sack* on Rev. J. H. Rose's Discourses on German Protestantism, Lond. 1828, Part 2.] *Neander*, Das verflossene halbe Jahrhundert in seinem Verhältniss zur Gegenwart in Zeitschr. f. christl. Wissensch. u. chr. Leben, 1 Jahrg. s. 215 ff. The Anti-Rationalistic Literature from the beginning of the Nineteenth Century, in *Tholuck's* Anzeiger, 1836, Nr. 15–18. *K. F. A. Kahnis*, Der innere Gang des deutschen Protestantismus seit Mitte des vorigen Jahrhunderts, Leipz. 1854, 2d ed. 1860 [translated by *Th. Meyer*, Edinb. 1856]. *Karl Schwarz*, Zur Geschichte der neuesten Theologie, Leipz. 1836, 4te Aufl. 1869. *Wangemann*, Sieben Bücher Preussischer Kirchengesch., Berlin 1858. †*J. E. Jörg*, Gesch. des Protestantismus in seiner neuesten Entwicklung, Freiburg 1858, 2 vols. [*Gregoire*, Histoire des Sectes religieuses depuis le Commencement du Siècle dernier, 5 vols. Paris 1828.] *Karl Beck*, Christliche Dogmengeschichte (2 Aufl.), 1864.

THE spirit of investigation having been awakened, and the belief in human authority shaken, by the Reformation of the sixteenth century, a more liberal and progressive movement was inaugurated. But as the Reformers, at the same time, declared, in the most decided terms, that no other foundation can be laid than that which is laid in Christ, and strengthened the belief in the divine authority of Scripture, they of course also directed the attention of Christians to the early history of the Christian Church. Neither of these two points should be overlooked, if we would form a correct judgment of Protestantism, and its significance in history. During the second half of the sixteenth, and the whole of the seventeenth century, most theologians had lost sight of its true meaning as regards the former aspect, by again submitting to the yoke of human authority, and thus preventing all progress. The very opposite tendency characterizes the eighteenth century. Theologians and philosophers, animated by an ardent desire after enlightenment and spiritual liberty, gradually renounced their allegiance to the only foundation on which the Reformers had thought it safe to build, and for which, no less than for liberty of thought and conscience, the martyrs of the Protestant Church had shed their blood. The authority of Holy Writ was by degrees impaired, together with that of the

symbolical books; and not long after, *those* doctrines which the earlier Protestants, as well as Roman Catholics, had rejected as antichristian, became prevalent in various sections of the Church. But, as in the seventeenth century there were not wanting mobile and free-thinking spirits, though the majority were stable; so, too, in the midst of the contests and storms of recent times, there were found men of a conservative tendency; and attempts were made to restore what had been destroyed, and to bring about a reconciliation between the two extremes. It is the task of the History of Doctrines, during this last period, to represent this remarkable struggle in all its details, and to treat of its elements separately, as well as in their relation to each other. This delineation, in its historical aspect, is nearly identical with the course of recent Church history; as to its substance, it leads directly into the sphere of dogmatic theology, the nearer it approaches the present times.

["The Reformation, from its commencement, included a double interest, that of universal reason along with that which was specifically religious. . . . In the consciousness of its freedom, the subjective spirit, moved by the pressure of the need of salvation, emancipated itself from everything which was in irreconcilable opposition to the religious consciousness. The freedom of scriptural interpretation had again become limited by the dogmatic pressure of the confessions of faith. . . . A rupture must ensue with a domineering system, which did not allow the freedom of the individual. But the relation was different so far as this, that the principle of self-emancipation was not now to be battled for; what had been already gained was to be grasped in its full significance, and carried out to its practical effects." *Baur*, Dg. 343, 344, 2d ed.]

§ 273.

Influence of Philosophy upon Theology.

It is an invincible testimony to the essential practical efficiency of Christianity, that it owed neither its origin, nor the restoration of its purer principles, to a system of philosophy (1). At the same time, its more profound speculative import, and its high philosophical significance, are clearly proved by the fact, that philosophy has always put itself into either hostile or friendly relations with theology, endeavouring either to destroy it, or to penetrate it with its own speculations and dialectics (2). The grand attempt made by the scholastics appeared at first successful. But after its degeneracy into the vain subtleties of the schools had brought philosophy into disrepute among evangelical Christians, the Protestant Church, which sprung up in opposition to this philosophy, kept aloof for a long time from the speculations of philosophy, entrenched in its strict systematic theology (3). Yet it must also be admitted, that it was Protestantism which awakened modern philosophy, and assisted in its development.

(1) Comp. above, § 17 and § 211.

(2) It is sufficient to refer to the phenomena of Neoplatonism, Gnosticism, and the philosophy of the school of Alexandria during the first period, and to the scholasticism of the third period.

(3) They were satisfied with the formal use of philosophy, the logical arrangement and connection of the material. Comp. § 238.

§ 274.

The Philosophy of Wolf.

**H. Wuttke*, Christian Wolfs eigene Lebensbeschreibung, Leipz. 1841. *Ludovici*, Entwurf einer Historie der Wolfischen Philosophie, Leipz. 1737, 3 vols. *Niedner*, Kirchengeschichte, s. 755 ff. [*Pusey*, u. s.] *Kuno Fischer*, Geschichte der neueren Phil., 1855.

It was not until the philosophy of Leibnitz (in the modified form in which it was presented by *Christian Wolf*) (1) had obtained more general authority, that it extended its influence also to theology, as the Leibnitzo-Wolfian system. The attempt to establish a system of natural religion, on the principle of demonstration (independently of revelation, but not in direct opposition to it) (2), met with a very different reception among the various parties in the Church. The pietists in particular were not only hostile to such innovations, but even partly persecuted their advocates (3). On the other side, the adherents of that moderate and rational form of orthodoxy which, towards the commencement of the eighteenth century, was represented by some able and learned men (4), hastened to adopt the demonstrative method, thinking that they might make use of natural theology as a convenient stepping-stone for revealed religion, and thus gain a solid foundation for the truths of the latter (5).

(1) *Wolf* was born A.D. 1679, in Breslau, appointed professor of mathematics in the University of Halle 1707, dismissed from office by the order of King Frederick William I. 1723, banished (under penalty of death), lived some time in Cassel and Marburg, was recalled 1740 by King Frederick II., appointed Chancellor, and died 1754.

(2) Among Wolf's *works* are: Vernünftige Gedanken von Gott, der Welt und der Seele des Menschen, auch allen Dingen überhaupt, 1719.—Anmerkungen über die vernünftigen Gedanken, etc. Theologia Naturalis, 1736, etc.

(3) One of the principal opponents of Wolf was *Joachim Lange* (born 1670, died 1744, as professor in the University of Halle). *He wrote:* Causa Dei et Religionis adversus Naturalismum, Atheismum, Judæos, Socinianos, et Pontificios, Hal. 1726, 1727, 3 vols., and several other treatises. On the progress of the controversy, and the writings to which it gave rise, see the work of *Wuttke* mentioned above (in which many statements made by previous writers are corrected). Several other writers joined Lange in combating the principles propounded by Wolf, *e.g. Francke, M. Daniel*

Strähler, etc. *Valentin Löscher* (died 1749) and *Joh. Franz Buddeus* of Jena (*he wrote:* Bedenken über Wolfs Philosophie, 1724), as well as the University of Upsal, in Sweden, pronounced against him, not to mention the Roman Catholics, headed by the Jesuits; though some of the latter made use of the philosophy of Wolf in their own schools.[1]

(4) Previous to the time of Wolf, *Pufendorf* had proposed to apply the mathematico-demonstrative method of argumentation to Christian theology, expecting to derive great advantage from such a treatment. See his Epistola ad Fratrem, in Act. Erudit. Lips. supplem. tom. ii. sect. 2, p. 98; *Heinrich*, s. 438. About the time of the rise of the Wolfian philosophy, several other theologians had commenced (apart from what was done by Pufendorf) to treat systematic theology in a spirit more liberal and less dependent upon traditional authorities. This shows that Wolf, though in a stricter method, acted in accordance with the spirit of the age. Among these theologians were: *Christ. Matth. Pfaff* (born 1686, died 1760): Institutiones Theolog. Dogmat. et Moral., Tub. 1720; even *J. F. Buddeus* himself (born 1667, died 1729), despite his opposition to Wolf (see the previous section), in his Institutiones Theolog. Dogmat., Lips. 1723, 1724, 1727, 1741, 4to. *Chr. Eberhard Weissmann* (born 1677, died 1747): Institutiones Theolog. exegetico-dogmaticæ, Tub. 1739, 4to. *J. Lorenz von Mosheim* (born 1694, died 1755): Elementa Theolog.-dogmat., edited by *Windheim*, Norimb. 1758.—In the Reformed Church, in addition to *J. A. Turretin* and *Samuel Werenfels* (comp. § 225), *J. F. Osterwald*, pastor of Neufchatel (born 1663, died 1747), contributed most to the transition to a new state of things. His Compendium Theologiæ (Basil.

[1] The danger which many apprehended from the spread of the Wolfian philosophy was not a mere fancy. "*It cannot well be said that the philosophy of Wolf endangered orthodox theology in a direct manner; on the contrary, we find that many of the followers of Wolf either adopted the principle of indifferentism as to positive religion, or formally confirmed it. But the distinction introduced by Wolf between natural and revealed religion*, i.e. *between religion which may be proved by demonstration, and religion which must be received by faith, prepared the way for the ascendency of the deistic principle of natural religion over the principles of revealed religion.*" *Lechler*, Geschichte des Deismus, s. 448. Comp. *Tholuck*, l.c. s. 10–23. *Saintes-Ficker* (see the literature of the next section), s. 54 ff.

1739) long remained the text-book of theology for the Swiss Reformed Church.

(5) Among the Lutheran theologians who adopted the method of Wolf were: *Jakob Carpov* (professor of mathematics in Weimar, born 1699, died 1768): Œconomia Salutis Novi Test. sive Theologia Revel. dogmatica methodo scientifica adornata, Vimar. 1737–1765, 4 vols. 4to.[1] *Joh. Gust. Reinbeck* (born 1682, died 1741, as an ecclesiastical councillor in Berlin; he enjoyed a great reputation as a preacher): Betrachtungen über die in der Augsb. Conf. enthaltenen und damit verknüpften göttlichen Wahrheiten, 1731–1741, 4 vols. 4to. *G. H. Ribow* (born 1703, died 1774): Instituti Dogmat. Theolog. methodo demonstrativa traditæ, Gott. 1740, 1741. *Israel Gottlieb Canz* (born 1690, died 1753): Compend. Theol. purioris, Tub. 1752.[2] *Peter Reusch* (born 1693, died 1757): Introductio in Theol. revelatam. *J. E. Schubert* (born 1717, died 1774): Introductio in Theol. rev. Jen. 1749, and Institutiones theol. dogm. 1749, 1753. *Siegm. Jakob Baumgarten* (born 1706, died 1757): Theses Theol. seu Elementa Doctrinæ sanctioris ad Duct. Breviarii, ed. *J. A. Freylinghausen*, Hal. 1746, 1750, 1767. — Evangelische Glaubenslehre mit Einleitung von *Semler*, Halle 1759, 1760, 3 vols. 4to. On the influence of the work of Baumgarten upon his age, see *Tholuck*, ii. s. 12.—Several Reformed theologians also followed the method of Wolf, more or less closely, such as *Daniel Wyttenbach* of Bern (born 1706, died 1779, a professor at Marburg): Tentamen Theol. Dogm. methodo scientifica pertractatæ, Bern. 1741, 1742, 2 vols. Francof. a. M. 1747, 4 vols. *Joh. Friedr. Stupfer* of Bern (died 1775): Institutiones Theol. Polemicæ, Tur. 1743–1747, 5 vols. Grundlegung zur wahren Relig. (a popular treatise), Zür. 1746–1753, 12 vols. *J. Chr. Beck* of Basel (born 1711, died 1785): Fundamenta Theol. Naturalis et Revelatæ, Bas. 1757 (comp. the Prolegomena to this work, in which the author expressly recommends the handling of natural

[1] Immediately after the publication of the first volume of this work, the opponents of Wolf expressed their belief that its author was either a Socinian or a Naturalist, who neither would nor could discuss the doctrine concerning Christ. But their suspicions were unfounded. See *Heinrich*, s. 444.

[2] He also *wrote*: Philosophiæ Leibnitzianæ et Wolfianæ Usus in Theologia per præcipua Fidei Capita, Lips. 1749. (This work enjoyed at the time great celebrity.)

religion as preparatory to that of revealed religion, p. 25 s.); Synopsis Institutionum universæ theologiæ, Bas. 1765 (until 1822 the theological text-book at Basel); and *Samuel Endemann* (born 1727, died 1789, professor at Marburg): Institutiones Theol. Dogmat. t. I. II., Hanov. 1777.

§ 275.

Influence of Deism and Naturalism. Rationalizing Attempts.

Lerminier, De l'Influence de la Philosophie du 18° Siècle, Paris 1833, Leipz. 1835. *Villemain*, Cours de Littérature Française; Tableau du 18° Siècle, Paris 1838, tom. ii. p. 222 ss. *Henke*, Kg. vi. (of 18th cent. ii.) edited by *Vater*. *Stäudlin*, Geschichte des Rationalismus und Supranaturalismus, Gött. 1826, s. 119 ff. *Amand Saintes*, Histoire Critique du rationalisme en Allemagne, Paris et Leips. 1841, 2d ed. 1843; in German, by *C. G. Ficker*, Lpz. 1847. **Schlosser*, Geschichte des 18 Jahrhunderts, Bd. i. s. 447, ii. s. 443 ff. *Hagenbach*, Gesch. des 18 und 19 Jahrh. 2te Ausg., Lpz. 1848, 2 vols. [*Mark Pattison*, Tendencies of Religious Thought in England, in Essays and Reviews, 1860, pp. 279-362.] *Ulrici*, Französ. Encyclopädisten, in *Herzog's* Realencyk., Bd. iv. 1-9. Comp. the lit. at § 238, especially *Lechler*.

While natural religion and theology, in a strict and sometimes pedantic scientific form, was thus in Germany retained within its proper limits, and made honourably subservient to revelation, the principles of Deism and Naturalism, developed in the preceding period, gained numerous adherents in England and France (1), and soon threatened to make their appearance also in Germany (2). During the second half of the eighteenth century, the most powerful attacks upon positive Christianity were made by the anonymous author of the *Wolfenbüttel Fragments* (3), which gave rise to fundamental controversies as to the rights of reason in matters of faith (4). The spirit of the age, influenced as it was by *Frederick the Great* of Prussia (5), also contributed to the spread of deistic tendencies, especially among the higher classes. Not only the leaders of literature during the eighteenth century (6), but some ministers of the Church, endeavoured gradually to introduce such principles among the educated, and even among the people (7). ["The more serious character of

English Deism at length passed over, even among the deists themselves, into the shallow frivolities of French naturalism, materialism, and atheism, and into the destructive tendencies of Voltaire and the Encyclopedists, whose influence reached Germany. The Wolfenbüttel Fragments were the German product of the energetic character of English Deism; and in these and kindred controversies, carried on by *Lessing* with all the power of his mind, the German spirit already showed that it was able to grapple with the boldest doubts, and that it could assume no other than a thoroughly critical relation to the contents of revelation."[1]]

(1) Comp. § 238, and *Lechler's* Geschichte des Deismus there referred to. To the number of those English deists (some of whom, as *Woolston*, *Tindal*, and *Chubb*, come over into the present period) whose names have been already mentioned, may be added Viscount *Bolingbroke* and *David Hume*. [*Henry St. John*, Viscount *Bolingbroke*, "the last of the deists," born 1678, Secretary of War 1704–1707, of State 1710–1715, impeached for becoming Secretary to Charles Stewart, died 1751. Life by *Goldsmith*, 1809. See *Leland's* Deistical Writers. *David Hume*, born 1711, died 1776, Treatise of Human Nature, 1737; Essays, 1741; Philos. Essays, 1748 (a new edition of the Treatise); Principles of Morals, 1751; Natural Hist. of Religion, 1755; Hist. of England, 1754–1762. Philosophical Works, Edinb. 4 vols. 1826, several edd. *Hume's* Essays on Miracles were answered by *Geo. Campbell*, *Leland* in his Deistical Writers, *Paley*, *Douglas*, and many others. Life and Correspondence, edited by *T. H. Burton*, 2 vols., Edinb. 1847.] *Bolingbroke* may be said to form the transition to the frivolous naturalism and gross materialism of the French philosophers, whose principles were set forth in the Système de la Nature (1740), in the works of *Condillac* (died 1780), *La Mettrie* (died 1751), *Helvetius* (died 1771), *Voltaire* (died 1778), and in those of the so-called Encyclopedists (Encyclopédie, ou Dictionnaire Universel, etc., 1751), *D'Alembert* (died 1783), and *Diderot*

[1] [*Baur*, Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte, s. 249 (1st ed.), 347 (2d and 3d ed.).]

(died 1784). *Jean Jacques Rousseau* (died 1778) differed from these as to his personal character and tendency, but in his Emile: Confessions d'un Vicaire Savoyard, showed himself opposed to positive religion.—For a comparison instituted between the English and French deists, see *Henke*, l.c. § 10. At all events, the more profound English philosophers exerted a far more considerable influence upon the learned men of Germany than the Frenchmen, whose writings met with greater success among the laymen. Only the Protestant Rousseau awakened German sympathies. Comp. *Tholuck*, ii. s. 33.

(2) It is a remarkable circumstance, which, however, admits of explanation, that even some of the German mystics adopted deistic principles, *e.g. Joh. Conrad Dippel*, surnamed the Christian Democritus (died 1734), and *J. Chr. Edelmann* (born 1698, died 1767). The latter, after having been for a short time connected with the Illuminati, followed in the steps of *Knutzen* (comp. *Henke*, § 23*b*). On the history of his life and his *work:* Moses mit aufgedecktem Angesicht, Freib. (Berleburg) 1740, 2 vols., see *J. H. Pratje*, Historische Nachrichte von Edelmann, Hamb. 1785, and *W. Elster*, Erinnerungen an J. C. Edelmann, Clausthal 1839.—*Chr. Tob. Damm* (born 1699, died 1778), a philologist, wrote (1765) a work upon the New Testament (under royal sanction), founded on deistic principles, and reduced the religion of Christ to mere natural religion in his *works:* Ueber den historischen Glauben, 1772, 2 vols., and Ueber die Religion, 1773.—The works of the English deists were also copiously translated into German, and welcomed with eagerness by numbers. See the Bekenntnisse of *Laukhard*, quoted by *Lechler*, s. 451; *Tholuck*, ii. s. 31. A catalogue of the most important deistic writings is given by *Baumgarten*, Geschichte der Religionsparteien, s. 129.

(3) *G. E. Lessing* published a series of treatises, containing essays and notices, under the title: "Beiträge zur Geschichte der Literatur, aus den Schätzen der herzoglichen Bibliothek zu Wolfenbüttel." The third of these treatises appeared 1774, under the title: Fragment eines Ungenannten, von Duldung der Deisten. (A fragment concerning the toleration of the deists, composed by an anonymous writer.) The fourth treatise, which was published 1777, contained five "fragmente"

—viz. 1. Von der Verschreiung der Vernunft auf den Kanzeln. (Concerning the denunciation of reason from the pulpit.) 2. Unmöglichkeit einer Offenbarung, die alle Menschen auf eine gegründete Art glauben könnten. (The impossibility of a revelation on which all men can found a reasonable belief.) 3. Durchgang der Israëliten durch rothe Meer. (The passage of the Israelites through the Red Sea.) 4. Dass die Bücher des Alten Testaments nicht geschrieben worden, eine Religion zu offenbaren. (That the books of the Old Testament were not written in order to reveal a religion.) 5. Ueber die Auferstehungsgeschichte. (On the history of the resurrection.) Last of all was published (1778) the boldest work: Von dem Zwecke Jesu und seiner Jünger, noch ein Fragment des Wolfenbüttler Ungenannten. (Concerning the object of Christ and His disciples, another fragment published by the anonymous Wolfenbüttel writer.) After Lessing's death, *C. A. E. Schmidt* (who was said to be a layman) published other works by the same anonymous writer (they referred for the most part to the Old Test.). It is now decided that Lessing was not the author of these works. They are generally ascribed to *H. S. Reimarus* (born 1694, in Hamburg, died 1768, who wrote a system of natural religion). For further particulars as to the authorship, see *Illgens* historische Zeitschrift, 1839, Heft 4, s. 97. In reply, *Lachmann*, in vol. xii. of Lessing's works; *Guhrauer*, Bodins Heptaplomeres, Berlin 1841, s. 257 ff. [Comp. *D. F. Strauss:* Der alte und der neue Glaube, ein Bekenntniss, 1872, etc.; *J. Sime*, Life of Lessing, Lond. 1878, 2 vols.]

(4) Controversy between Lessing and Götze, chief pastor at Hamburg.—Nathan der Weise (1779).—He further published Erziehung des Menschengeschlechts, 1780: on the question whether this was on the basis of a work by *Thaer*, see *Illgens* Zeitschrift, 1839.—In the year 1784 appeared his Theolog. Nachlass (posthumous writings). As regards the relation in which Lessing stood to Christianity, see *Twesten*, Dogmatik, i. s. 19. *Röhr*, Kleine theologische Schriften, 1841, s. 158 ff. *Karl Schwarz*, Lessing als Theologe, Halle 1854. [His Education of the Human Race and several other works are translated into English. Comp. *J. Sime*, Life of Lessing, where a full account of his works is given.]

(5) On the stay which Voltaire made at the Prussian court, and the literary labours of Frederick II., see *A. F. Büsching*, Character Friedrichs II., Halle 1788. *Preuss*, Friedrich der Grosse, 5 vols. Berlin 1833, 1834. [*Carlyle*, Life of Frederick the Great, Lond. var. ed.]

(6) "The *Allgemeine deutsche Bibliothek, edited by Nicolai, which during the first period of its existence* (*it was founded* 1765) *enjoyed unlimited authority in the literary world, combated the old faith in an insidious tone, and denounced everything which was above its own prosaic views of religion and morals, as superstition or Jesuitism.*" *Hase*, Kg. § 453. Deistic tendencies were furthered and spread in families, as well as in schools, by the Philanthropinism of *Basedow* (born 1723, died 1790), *Salzmann* (born 1744, died 1811), and *Campe* (born 1746, died 1818). On *Basedow's* work, Philalethie (Altona 1764, 2 vols.), see *Heinrich*, s. 467 ff. Among the people the interest for systematic theology had considerably diminished. A calculating system of expediency deprived life of all its poetry, and reduced religion to a mere code of morals, useful for our civil duties. Among the piously minded, *C. F. Gellert* (1715–1769) continued to enjoy great authority; his views of Christianity, though didactic and prolix, were distinguished by depth of feeling. Nor had *Klopstock's* Messiah (1748), which had once been received with eagerness, fallen into oblivion. On the other hand, the works of *Wieland* (since 1760) contributed to the spread of a refined freethinking, as well as of French frivolity, among the German people. *Baumgarten-Crusius*, Compendium, i. s. 445, note k, shows with great acuteness the connection existing between that sentimentality, which was intended to serve as a substitute for true religious feelings, and deistic tendencies. (On Lessing, see above, note 4; on Herder, comp. § 281; and *Pfleiderer*, Religionsphilosophie, 1879.)—Some attempts were also made to form societies on the basis of deistic principles. Such were the "Illuminati," founded by *Weishaupt* in the year 1777: the "Freunde der Aufklärung" (friends of enlightenment) in Berlin, 1783; see *Tholuck's* literarischer Anzeiger, 1830, Nr. 8; and *Bahrdt's* Gesellschaft der XXII. (Bahrdt's Society of the XXII.), comp. *Tholuck's* vermischte Schriften, ii. s. 115.

(7) The most conspicuous among them was *C. F. Bahrdt*

(born 1741, died 1792); comp. his Autobiography, Berlin 1790 ff. In his Versuch eines biblischen Systems der Dogmatik (Gotha and Leipzig 1769, 1770, Frankf. and Leipz. 1771, 2 parts; see *Heinrich*, p. 469 ff.) he apppeared to side with the advocates of orthodoxy; but in his writings, composed in a later period of his life, such as his Glaubensbekenntniss (1779, Confession of faith), his Briefe über die Bibel im Volkston (1782, Popular letters on the Bible), his Plan und Zweck Jesu (1784, The plan and aim of Jesus), and some others, he endeavoured to undermine all positive religion.—Several other theological writers of the present age contributed to the spread of Deism, or, at least, of indifference in religious matters, and of a superficial rationalism, *e.g. J. A. Eberhard* (formerly pastor in Charlottenburg, afterwards professor of theology at Halle, died 1809), who wrote the Neue Apologie des Socrates, Berlin 1776, 1778, 2 vols.; *G. S. Steinbart* (professor of theology at Frankfurt on the Oder, died 1809), (Eudämonistisches) System der reinen Philosophie, oder Glückseligkeitslehre des Christenthums, für die Bedürfnisse seiner *aufgeklärten* Landsleute und Andrer, die nach Weisheit fragen, eingerichtet, Züll. 1778, 1780, 1786 (comp. *Heinrich*, s. 488 ff.); *W. A. Teller* (provost at Berlin, died 1804), who in his Dictionary (first published in Berlin 1772) tried to correct traditional notions, partly with good sense, but partly also in a superficial manner.—Several diluted and tame translations of the Bible also helped forward this alleged illumination; these had a worthy forerunner in the somewhat older Wertheim version of 1735. Sermons on nature, and morality, and agriculture, and the cow-pox, showing a total misapprehension of the idea of Christian worship and Christian festivals, helped on the movement; as did also Dietrich's and Teller's so-called improvements in hymn-books, which only made them worse. And all this was to illustrate the utility of the office of the preacher!

§ 276.

Apologetic Efforts. Changes in the mode of treating Theology. Modern Compendiums of Systematic Theology.

The attacks of the Deists gave rise to numerous refutations and Antideistica (1). But it soon became evident that the advocates of positive Christianity were not agreed as to the best mode of operation; in the general obscurity, it was found increasingly difficult to distinguish friends from foes (2). Many of the best and ablest men willingly abandoned what they considered the mere outworks, in order to save the citadel itself; nor was it without some reason that they expected to advance the cause of the "religion of Jesus," thus fallen into disrepute among the educated, by presenting its truths in a clearer and more tasteful form, and by adapting them to the age and its wants (3). It was generally admitted that the old state of things could not continue; from the commencement of the eighteenth century, theologians exerted themselves to give a new impulse to their science. The unprejudiced examination of the Bible was promoted by a more exact knowledge of the East, and more profound classical studies; the history of the text of the Bible was cleared up by the critical investigations of *Mill*, *Wetstein*, *Bengel*, and others (4), and the history of the Canon made the subject of new researches. In this respect the labours of *Michaelis* (5), *Ernesti* (6), and *Semler* (7) introduced a new period. Chiefly in consequence of the labours of *Mosheim*, Church History ceased to be merely the servant of party purposes; he gave the example of a firm adherence to orthodoxy, united with impartiality in judging of heretical doctrines (8). Thus the theological Compendia of *J. D. Michaelis* (9), *J. D. Heilmann* (10), *G. T. Zachariä* (11), *G. F. Seiler* (12), *J. Ch. Döderlein* (13), *S. F. N. Morus* (14), and others, bore the traces of this progress, while their authors still endeavoured to preserve, as

far as possible, the purity of evangelical doctrine. As regards this last point, the principles of *W. A. Teller* (15), *E. J. Danov* (16), *J. F. Gruner* (17), *J. C. R. Eckermann* (18), and *C. Ph. Henke* (19), were less rigid: in their writings they manifested a growing tendency to neological principles. Among the theologians of the Reformed Church, *Stosch* (20) continued a faithful advocate of the older doctrinal system, while *Mursinna* (21) gave in his adhesion, with some caveats, to the modern illumination.

(1) Among the followers of Wolf, *Stiebritz*, professor of philosophy at Halle, in opposition to the deists, and in defence of the principles of his master, wrote his "Beweis für die Wirklichkeit einer Offenbarung wider die Naturalisten, nebst einer Widerlegung derer, welche dem Wolfischen System eine Beförderung der Naturalisterei beimessen," Halle 1746. (*Thorschmidt*, Freidenkerbibliothek, ii. s. 655 ff.; *Lechler*, s. 449.) After the example of *Pfaff*, chancellor of the University of Halle (who published Akademische Reden über den Entwurf der theologiæ antideisticæ, 1759), special lectures were delivered against the deists (see *Lechler*, u. s.; *Tholuck*, Vermischte Schriften, ii. s. 25). On the apologetical writings of this period, see *Tholuck*, i. s. 150 ff.—Among the English apologists we may mention *Lardner* (the Credibility of the Gospel History, London 1730–1755, 12 vols.), *Addison*, *Newton*, *Berkeley*, etc. [*Joseph Addison*, born 1672, died 1719: On the Evidences of the Christian Religion, 1730; *Thomas Newton*, Bishop of Bristol, born 1704, died 1782; works, 6 vols. 1787: Dissertation on Prophecies, 2 vols., 10th ed., London 1804.—*George Berkeley*, born 1684, died 1753, Bishop of Cloyne: Principles of Human Knowledge, 1710; Three Dialogues between Hylas and Philonus, 1713; Proposal for Converting Savage Americans to Christianity, 1725; *Works and Life, by Dr. *A. C. Fraser*, Oxford 1871 ff., 4 vols. *Joseph Butler*, Bishop of Durham, born 1692, died 1752. When nineteen years of age, he corresponded with Dr. Samuel Clarke on the Principles of his Demonstration of the Being of God. Fifteen sermons preached at the Rolls Chapel, 1726. *The Analogy of Religion, Natural and Revealed, to the Constitution

and Course of Nature, was published in 1736; his works, by Bishop Halifax, 2 vols. 1849; numerous editions of the Analogy. In England, the vulgar infidelity was represented by *Thomas Paine*, born 1737, died 1809: Common Sense, 1791; Rights of Man, 1792; Age of Reason, 1792–1795. *Richard Watson*, Bishop of Llandaff (born 1737, died 1814): An Apology for the Bible, in a Series of Letters addressed to Thomas Paine, 2d ed., London 1796. *C. Leslie* (nonjuror, died 1722): Short and Easy Method with Deists; works, 7 vols. 8vo, Oxford 1832. *William Paley*, born 1743, died 1805: Natural Theology; View of the Evidences; Horæ Paulinæ; Moral and Political Philosophy, etc.; complete works, 4 vols. 8vo, Lond. 1838, and often. *William Warburton*, Bishop of Gloucester, born 1698, died 1779. Works, 12 vols., Lond. 1811; the Divine Legation of Moses, 3 vols. *Richard Hurd*, Bishop of Worcester, born 1720, died 1808; works, 8 vols. 8vo, Lond. 1811. Introduction to the Study of Prophecies—the Warburtonian Lectures for 1772.] Among the German apologists were *Haller* (Briefe über die wichtigsten Wahrheiten der Offenbarung, Bern 1772), *Lilienthal* (Gute Sache der Offenbarung, Königsb. 1750–1782), *Less*, *Nösselt*, etc. The "Wolfenbüttel Fragments" also gave rise to numerous controversial writings (comp. the Allgemeine deutsche Bibliothek, vols. 30 and 40), the best of which were composed by *Döderlein*, *Less*, *Michaelis*, *Barthels*, and *Semler*.

(2) *Philip Skelton* [born 1707, died 1787]: Offenbare Deisterei, 1756, 2 vols. [Ophiomachus, or Deism revealed], pref. quoted by *Tholuck*, i. p. 21: "*Our modern apologists too frequently defend Christianity on deistic principles, and too readily represent their own articles of faith in a new dress; they expect that such a course of proceeding will be advantageous to their cause.*" In proof of this the example of *John Taylor* might be adduced [of Norwich, born 1694, died 1762, author of a work on Original Sin, 1738, etc.]. Comp. *Ernesti*, Neue theologische Bibliothek, i. s. 115. *Tholuck*, l.c. s. 30.

(3) Thus *Jerusalem*, *Spalding*, *Zollikoffer*, and others, whose honest intentions none can reasonably doubt. See *Jerusalem*, Betrachtungen über die vornehmsten Wahrheiten der Religion, 1768, 5th edit. 1773–1792, 2 vols. Second series, 1793, 2 vols. *J. J. Spalding* (died 1804): Gedanken über den Werth

der Gefühle im Christenthum, 1761 (1784): Ueber die Nutzbarkeit des Predigtamtes, 1775; Vertraute Briefe, die Religion betreffend, 1788. *G. J. Zollikoffer* wrote sermons and devotional books. *A. W. Sack* belonged to the same class of writers. The theory of accommodation adopted by these men is fairly estimated by *Steffens:* Was ich erlebte, i. s. 258 ss.

(4) Compare the Introductions to the New Testament. How much sacred criticism was brought into connection with neological tendencies, may be seen in the case of Wetstein; see *Hagenbach,* in Illgens Zeitschrift, 1839, 1. But the necessity of a critical study of Scripture was no less felt by the advocates of the opposite principle, *e.g. Bengel,* who strenuously applied himself to it in the service of the Lord.

(5) *John David Michaelis* was born 1717, and died 1791. Comp. *Tholuck,* i. s. 130. Of his disciples, *Eichhorn* is best known as the most eminent of the rationalistic theologians of the present period. Though Michaelis seemed for a time to have adopted the principles of unbiassed criticism and exegesis, he soon after began to adapt his views to the spirit of the age. He also endeavoured to explain the miracles of Christ in a natural manner. [Introduction to New Test., transl. from the 4th ed. by *Herbert Marsh,* afterwards Bp. of Peterborough, 4 vols. in 6, Lond. 1802. *Michaelis'* Commentaries on Laws of Moses, transl. by *Alex. Smith,* 4 vols., Lond. 1814.]

(6) *John August Ernesti* was born 1707, and died 1781. *He wrote:* Institutio interpretis N. Test., Lips. 1761, ed. *Ammon,* 1792, 1809. "*With the name of this theologian is connected the transition to more liberal principles in the interpretation of Scripture.*" *Klausen,* Hermeneutik, s. 291. On the merits of his work (which were not very great), see Klausen, l.c. s. 291. [Principles of Bibl. Interpretation, transl. by Bp. *C. A. Terrot,* Edinb. 1845.]

(7) *Johann Salomo Semler* was born 1725, and died 1791, professor of theology in the University of Halle. Compare his Autobiography (which takes in also the history of his times), Halle 1781, 1782, 2 vols. It was especially Semler who, "*without forming a school of his own, may be said to have carried the torch which kindled the conflagration, the effects of which have not yet disappeared.*" *Tholuck,* ii. s. 39. Of his

numerous (171) writings we mention only those which have reference to our present subject: Von freier Untersuchung des Kanons (Halle 1771–1775). Institutio ad Doctrinam Christianam liberaliter discendam (Hal. 1774). Versuch einer freien theologischen Lehrart, Halle 1777 ff. The cardinal points of Semler's theology are the distinction which he made between theology and religion (morality), and his endeavours to represent the sacred Scriptures as having a merely local and temporary character. An account of his life and writings is given by *Tholuck*, ii. s. 39–83. *H. Schmid*, Die Theologie Semlers, Nördlingen 1858. The History of Doctrines owes its origin to *Semler's* introduction to *Baumgarten's* Compendium of systematic theology (see above, § 16).

(8) See *F. Lücke*, Narratio de Joanne Laurentio Moshemio, Gött. 1837, 4to. Soon after his death ecclesiastical history was, like exegesis, made subservient to the spirit of the times (*Spittler* and *Henke*; the pragmatic method adopted by *Planck*). The History of Doctrines was made use of to show the changeableness of the doctrines of Christianity.

(9) Comp. Theol. Dogm., Gött. 1760, ed. 2, 1874.

(10) *Heilmann* was born 1727, and died 1764, professor at Göttingen. *He wrote:* Comp. Theol. Dogm., Gött. 1761, ed. 3, 1780.

(11) *Zachariä* was born 1729, and died 1777, as professor of theology in the University of Kiel. *He wrote:* Biblische Theologie, oder Untersuchung des biblischen Grundes der vornehmsten theologischen Lehren, Gött. u. Kiel 1771–1775. The last part was edited by *Vollborth*, 1786. Zachariä understood by biblical theology: "*not that theology, the substance of which is taken from Scripture, for in this sense every theological system must be biblical, but more generally a precise definition of all the doctrines treated of in systematic theology, the correct understanding of these doctrines, in accordance with scriptural notions, and the best proofs.*" *Heinrich*, s. 515 ff. This was, accordingly, the first attempt to treat *Biblical Theology* as a distinct branch of theological science, independently of systematic theology. His example was followed by *W. F. Hufnagel* (Handbuch der biblischen Theologie, Erlangen 1785–1791), *Ammon*, *De Wette*, *Baumgarten-Crusius*, and others.

(12) *Seiler* was born 1733, and died 1807, as professor of

theology in the University of Erlangen. *He wrote:* Theol. Dogm. Polem. c. comp. dogmat., Erl. 1774, 3d ed. 1789.

(13) *Döderlein* was born 1745, taught at Altorf and Jena, and died 1792, a professor at Bützow. *He wrote:* Institutio Theologi Christiani in capitibus religionis theoreticis nostris temporibus accommodata, Alt. 1780, 1782, 1784, 1787, 2 vols. In the preface to this work he expressed himself as follows (quoted by *Heinrich*, s. 493): "Theologians must not now invent new doctrines, and go beyond Scripture; *neither should they rest satisfied with the labours of their predecessors*, but define more precisely what they have said, make use of modern explanations and new modes of representing certain doctrines, and *have a special regard to the wants of the age.* Hence they must examine those doctrines which are now most of all disputed, and define them the more carefully and accurately. As regards their mode of argumentation, *they must also adapt themselves to the circumstances of the time*, and avoid approving of and retaining all arguments brought forward by earlier writers, which are in themselves doubtful and uncertain; they must rather avail themselves of the *great advances recently made in biblical exegesis*, so as to be more prudent in the selection of the arguments by which to prove particular doctrines; they must not consider their number, but their internal merit, and only choose such as are clear and conclusive," etc.

(14) *Morus* was born 1736, and died 1792, as professor of theology in the University of Leipzig. *He wrote:* Epitome Theologiæ Christianæ, Lips. 1789, *Heinrich*, s. 498 ff.

(15) *Teller* was born 1734, and died 1804 (compare § 275, note 7). *He wrote:* Lehrbuch des christlichen Glaubens, 1763; Religion der Volkommnern, 1792.

(16) *E. Jakob Danov* was born 1741, and died 1782, as professor of theology in the University of Jena. *He wrote:* Theologiæ dogmaticæ Institut., libb. ii., Jen. 1772, 1776. The Ketzeralmanach of 1781 (Bahrdt's) says of him: "*He wears an overcoat like that of the regular theologian, but under it is the uniform of a volunteer.*"

(17) *Johann Friedrich Gruner* was born 1723, and died 1778, as professor of theology in the University of Halle. *He wrote:* Institutionum Theologiæ dogmat., libb. iii., Halle 1777.

"*He was a man of much originality and historical learning. His principle endeavour was to prove, like Semler, the later origin of the orthodox doctrines, and the many changes through which they have gone, with this difference, that Gruner, in support of his theory, had recourse to the Platonizantes, Semler to the Judaizantes.*" *Tholuck*, l.c. s. 106. Comp. *Heinrich*, s. 482. The main idea pervading the whole book is, that the principal doctrines of Christianity had been corrupted as early as the close of the first century, by the influence of the Platonic and Oriental philosophy of the Alexandrian school.

(18) *J. Caspar Rudolph Eckermann* was born 1754, and died 1836, as professor of theology in the University of Kiel. Among his *works* were: Compend. Theolog. Christ. theoret. bibl. histor. 1791; Handbuch für das systematische Studium der christlichen Glaubenslehre, 1801, 1803, 4 vols.

(19) *Conrad Philip Henke* was born 1752, and died 1809, as professor of theology in the University of Helmstädt, and abbot of Michaelstein. *He wrote:* Lineamenta Institutt. Fidei Christ. histor. criticar., Helmst. 1793, 2d ed. 1795. In the preface to this work he enumerates three kinds of superstition which he must combat—1. Christolatry; 2. Bibliolatry; 3. Onomatolatry; at the same time he speaks of Morus and Döderlein in terms expressive of high esteem.

(20) *Eberhard Heinr. Daniel Stosch* was born 1716, and died 1781, as professor of theology in the University of Frankfurt on Oder. *He wrote:* Introductio in Theolog. dogm. Franc. ad Viadr. 1788; Institut. Theol. Dogm., ibid. 1779. (Comp. *Heinrich*, s. 551.)

(21) *Samuel Mursinna* was born 1717, and died 1795, as professor of theology in the University of Halle. *He wrote:* Compendium Theologiæ Dogmaticæ, Halle 1777. Comp. *Heinrich*, s. 549: "*He made diligent use of the labours of modern theologians, as far as they have respect to a more correct definition of doctrines; nor did he overlook the opinions of earlier divines, but made mention of them, as well as stated the arguments commonly adduced in their support; nevertheless he did not always pronounce his own judgment concerning their merit, but left it to his readers to choose between the old and the*

new." *Bahrdt*, in his Ketzeralmanach, calls him "the staff-quartermaster of the Reformed partisan-corps."

Compendiums of systematic theology, written in a popular style, were published by *Less* (1779, 1789) and *Griesbach* (1786, 1789), who also endeavoured to combine the old with the new.

§ 277.

Reaction. Edict of Religion. Orthodox Pietism.

To oppose a barrier to the further spread of this fast-growing rationalism, was a bold enterprise, as was clearly proved by the failure of the two measures resorted to by the King of Prussia, the publication of an Edict of Religion in the year 1788, and the institution of an ecclesiastical tribunal (1). It was necessary that the opposing elements should spontaneously develope their results from within. The pietistic tendency of the school of Halle (originally founded by Spener, Francke, and others) had indeed in its second stadium lost much of its earlier vigour, and degenerated into a dead formalism (2). But in opposition to the demonstrative as well as negative tendency of Rationalism, two theologians of Würtemberg, *J. A. Bengel* (3) and *F. Ch. Oetinger* (4), gave a new direction to theology, by introducing into it not only positive, but also pietistic and mystical elements; *Ch. A. Crusius* (5) followed their example. Societies for practical as well as philosophical purposes were founded (6), in order to keep alive positive religion among the people. Thus, in the minds of many, the faith of their forefathers was preserved not only as a dead legacy, but assumed here and there, for the most part in the form of Pietism, depth and independence, in contrast with the superficial tendencies of the age (7).

(1) This edict was issued (July 9th) by Frederick William II., at the instigation of *Wöllner*, one of the king's ministers; see Acten, Urkunden und Nachrichten zur neuesten Kirchengeschichte, Bd. i. s. 461 ff. By another edict theological works

were subjected to the censorship of persons appointed by the king. In addition, a committee (consisting of *Hermes, Hillmer,* and *Woltersdorf*) were appointed to visit and examine the clergy. The proceedings of this committee, the trial of pastor *Schulz* of Gielsdorf (1791), and the titles of all the works published for and against the edict, are given in *Henke,* Beurtheilung aller Schriften, welche durch das preussische Religionsedict veranlasst sind, Kiel 1793. Respecting the ill success of those measures, *Hermes* (of Halle) expressed himself as follows: "*We are looked upon as persons of consequence, nevertheless we have not yet succeeded in removing one single neological village pastor from office; thus everything works against us.*" See *Tholuck,* ii. s. 126 ff. Comp. Das preuss. Religionsedict, Halle 1842.

(2) See *Semler's* Biography, i. s. 48 ff.—"*Many pious and in many respects estimable men, who belonged to the second generation of the school of Halle, displayed a weak-minded and painful timidity.*" *Tholuck,* ii. s. 8. *H. Schmid,* Geschichte des Pietismus, Nördlingen 1863. The conduct of the Halle pietists in the Wolfian controversy also brought the whole tendency into disrepute.

(3) *Bengel* was born 1687, was at first tutor and preacher in a monastery, died 1752, as a prelate and doctor of theology at Stuttgart. See *J. Ch. F. Burk,* Dr. J. A. Bengels Leben und Wirken, Stuttgart 1832.—His labours for the promotion of the critical knowledge of the Bible are deserving of special notice. He is well known as an advocate of Millenarianism. Concerning his doctrinal opinions, which were founded on his exegetical studies, see *Burk,* p. 353 ff. Comp. the article by *Hartmann,* in *Herzog's* Realenc. ii. s. 56 ff. [*Burk's* Life of Bengel, transl. by *R. F. Walker,* Lond. 1837. His Gnomon of New Test., transl. by *A. R. Fausset,* and others, 8 vols., Edinb. 1860.] *Von der Goltz,* Die theologische Bedeutung J. A. Bengels u. seiner Schule, Jahrbb. f. deutsche Theol. vi. 3.

(4) *Oetinger* was born 1702, and died 1782, as prelate of the monastery of Murrhard. *He wrote:* Theologia ex Idea Vitæ deducta, in 6 locos redacta, quorum quilibet 1. secundum sensum communem, 2. sec. mysteria scripturæ, 3. sec. formulas theticas nova et experimentali methodo pertractatur. Francof.

et Lips. 1765. In this work he endeavoured to develope the entire system of faith in a dynamic and genetic method from the idea of life. In opposition to the mathematical method of Wolf, he observes in the preface, p. 3: Ordo geometricus incipit ab una aliqua idea abstracta; ordo generativus, ut in seminibus patet, incipit a toto idque per minima explicat æquabiliter, quod nos nonnisi simulacris imperfectis imitari possumus. He therefore advises theologians to ascertain first of all the sensus communis, cujus præceptor est ipse Deus (Ps. xciv. 10); then to examine the doctrine of Scripture, and to build on it the doctrine of the Church. He finds fault with the philosophy of Wolf principally because it has converted the terms, life, kingdom, spirit, etc., to which Scripture attaches a definite meaning, into mere abstract ideas, and thus originated a system of false idealism which resolves everything into mere symbolical phraseology. But at the same time he introduces much that is cabalistic, and refers to his work: Oeffentliches Denkmahl der Lehrtafel der Princessin Antonia, etc., Tüb. 1763, which is of an entirely cabalistic character. There is in his writings a mixture of the mystical and speculative tendency of J. Böhm with the pietistic and practical of Spener. As regards the relation in which he stood to Swedenborg, compare the following section. Comp. the translation of his Theologia ex Idea Vitæ into German (Theologie aus der Idee des Lebens, etc.), by *Jul. Hamberger*, Stuttg. 1852; and **C. A. Auberlen*, Die Theosophie Fr. Chr. Oetingers nach ihren Grundzügen, ein Beitrag zur Dogmengesch. und zur Gesch. der Philos., mit Vorwort von *Richard Rothe* (Tübing. 1848), Basel 1859. Oetinger's Leben und Briefe, von *K. C. E. Ehmann*, 1859. Oetinger's Sämmtliche Schriften, herausg. von *Ehmann*, 1858–1863, 5 vols.

(5) *Crusius* was a disciple of Bengel, and an opponent of the Leibnitzo-Wolfian philosophy; he was born 1715, and died 1775, as professor of theology and philosophy in the University of Leipzig. *He wrote:* Opuscula philosophico-theologica, Lips. 1750. Die wahre Gestalt der Religion, 1754. Hypomnemoneumata ad Theol. propheticum, Lips. 1764–1771, 2 vols. Vorstellung von dem eigentlichen schriftmässigen Plan des Reichs Gottes, Lpz. 1768. Moral-theologie, Lpz. 1772, 1773. Comp. *Schröckh*, vi. s. 106 ff., vii. s. 647, viii. s. 41,

and s. 108. *Buhle*, Bd. v. s. 589 ff. *Reinhard*, Geständn. s. 68 ff. *Würtemann*, Einleitung in das Lehrgebäude des Herrn Dr. Crusius, Wbg. 1757. *Herzog's* Realenc. iii. s. 192 ff.

(6) Such societies were formed at Stockholm (1771) and the Hague (1785). The Deutsche Christenthumsgesellschaft, *ohne Rücksicht auf Confessionsunterschied* (*i.e.* irrespective of denominational differences), was founded (1779) by *J. A. Urlsperger*, a Lutheran theologian. As its chief seats were said to be Basel, London, and Berlin, see *J. A. Urlsperger*, Beschaffenheit und Zweck einer zu errichtenden *deutschen Gesellschaft* thätiger Beförderer reiner Lehre und wahrer Gottseligkeit, Basel 1781.

(7) See *Bretschneider*, Die Grundlage des evangelischen Pietismus, Lpz. 1833. *Binder*, Der Pietismus und die moderne Bildung, Stuttg. 1839. *Märklin*, Darstellung und Kritik des modernen Pietismus, Stuttg. 1839. Comp. *Dorner*, in the Studien und Kritiken, 1840, 1. [" *Pietism let dogmas stand in their external form, believing that it could have religion and Christianity, if not without dogmas, yet without a system of dogmas in this particular form. By emphasizing the internal experience of religion, its subjective worth, . . . pietism itself made the transition to a standpoint, in which the individual (subject) not only lays claim to his own subjective rights, but is also under the power of a more comprehensive principle.*" *Baur*, Dg. s. 345.]

§ 278.

Zinzendorf and the United Brethren. Wesley and the Methodists. Swedenborg.

In the course of the eighteenth century a new sect took its rise, which exerted a considerable influence upon the mind of the age, and the development of Christian life in general. It was founded at Herrnhut by *Count Zinzendorf* (1), and is known with its branches by the name of the *Society of the United Brethren* (2). Though owing its origin for the most part to Pietism (3), it differed from it on several points, its

object being, not so much a general reform of the Church and its doctrines, as the organization of a particular Christian community. Count Zinzendorf for himself adopted the Confession of Augsburg as his creed, but without excluding the adherents of other Christian Confessions (4). Nevertheless, by attaching great importance to certain doctrines, and by his mode of treating them, he impressed a novel and somewhat sentimental stamp upon the old Lutheran theology. The theology of Herrnhut is characterized by a spirit of ardent love to the person of the Saviour, and a hearty reliance upon His merits, but it is at the same time deeply tinged with a sensuous tendency (5). The theologians of his school, conscious of a higher vocation, endured with calmness the scorn of the world, and the censures passed upon them by learned and pious divines (6). *John Wesley*, the founder of *Methodism*, in his earnest preaching of repentance, was animated by a practical rather than a theological spirit, and exerted in his time a far greater influence upon England than upon Germany (7). More sympathy was there felt (in addition to the pietist and mystic tendencies) with the theosophic doctrines of *Immanuel Swedenborg*, the founder of the *Church of the New Jerusalem* (8). These consisted chiefly in a peculiar mixture of rationalistic and mystical ideas, and made progress in wide circles.

(1) *Zinzendorf* was born 1700, and died 1760. See the Biographies of *Spangenberg*, *Schrautenbach*, Gnadau 1851; *Varnhagan von Ense* (Biographische Denkmale, Bd. v.), and *Tholuck* (vermischte Schriften, i. s. 433). *G. Müller* (Selbstbekenntnisse merkwürdiger Männer, Bd. iii.), *Herder*, Adrastea (Werke zur Philosophie, x. s. 71). *Knapp*, in the Preface to his ed. of Z.'s hymns [1845]. **Burkhardt*, Graf Zinzendorf u. die Brüdergemeine, Gotha 1866.

(2) The first congregation was founded A.D. 1722. On the history of the Society of the United Brethren, see *Cranz*, Alte und neue Brüderhistorie, Barby 1772, continued by *Hegner*, 1794–1804. *Schaaf*, die evangel. Brüdergem., Leipz.

1825. See the literature in *Niedners* Kirchengesch. s. 763. [*A. Bost*, Histoire ancienne et moderne de l'église des Frères de Bohème et Moravie, 2 vols., Paris 1844. Sketches of Moravian History, Lond. R. T. S.]

(3) Pietism at the beginning of the eighteenth century had either degenerated into a dead formalism, or it was in part corrupted by all sorts of fanatical tendencies which attached themselves to it. It belongs to the History of the Church, rather than the History of Doctrines, to give an estimate of these. See *F. W. Krug*, Kritische Geschichte der protest. Schwärmerei, Sectirerei, und der gesammten un- und widerkirchlichen Neuerungen im Grossherzogthum Berg, Elberfeld 1851. *W. Barthold*, Die Erweckten im protest. Deutschland während des Ausgangs des 17 und der ersten Hälfte des 18 Jahrhunderts (in *Raumer's* Taschenbuch, 1852). *Göbel*, Geschichte des christl. Lebens, etc., 1860, 3 vols.

(4) This (relative) indifference as regards denominational differences gave offence to many. Zinzendorf himself adopted the Augsburg Confession; his Church was also recognized (1748) by the ecclesiastical authorities of Saxony as one whose creed was allied to that of the Augsburg Confession. But some Reformed congregations, in the διασπορᾷ (*e.g.* that of Basel), did not hesitate to join the Society of the United Brethren.

(5) Terms such as *Bluttheologie* (*i.e.* the theology of Christ's Blood), *Wunden-Litanei* (*i.e.* the litany of Christ's wounds), *Wunden-Homilien* (*i.e.* the homilies on Christ's wounds), etc., were introduced by Zinzendorf and his followers. In their sacred hymns reference was frequently made to Christ's blood, wounds, His pierced side, etc.; compare the work entitled: Die *altlutherische Bluttheologie* in einem Auszuge aus des sel. Dr. Ahasveri Fritzschens sogenannten Himmelslust und Weltunlust, with the motto: Pasce me vulneribus, mens dulcescet, Leipzig und Görlitz 1750; from which it is evident that similar phraseology had been employed by others before the time of Zinzendorf. (Ahasv. Fritzsche died A.D. 1701.) —More moderate expressions were used by Bishop *A. G. Spangenberg* (born 1704, died 1792); see his Idea Fidei Fratrum, oder kurzer Begriff der christlichen Lehre, Barby 1779, 1783. With the exception of that part of his work in which he treats of their ecclesiastical constitution, there is

nothing in it which had not been propounded by other evangelical theologians. "*The characteristic of the teaching of Spangenberg is a great carefulness never in any point to go beyond the immediate testimony of Scripture and experience, and when possible not to depart from the evangelical and ecclesiastical type of doctrine.*" *Burkhardt*, l.c. s. 153.

(6) Among these we may mention *Carpzov* of Dresden, *Siegmund Jakob Baumgarten* of Halle, *John Philip Fresenius* of Frankfurt on Main (1747–1749), *J. A. Bengel* (1751), *Steinmetz*, abbot of the monastery of Bergen, *J. G. Walch*, and others.

(7) *John Wesley* was born 1703, and died 1791. Comp. *Southey*, the life of John W., and the rise and progress of Methodism, 2d ed., Lond. 1820, 2 vols. (many ed.); translated into German by *F. A. Krummacher*, Hamb. 1828. *H. Moore*, the life of J. W., Lond. 1824, 2 vols. *Watson*, the life of John Wesley; translated into German, with a preface by *Bonnet*, Frankf. 1839. *Burckhardt*, Vollständige Geschichte der Methodisten in England, Nürnb. 1795, 2 vols. *Baum*, Der Methodismus, Zür. 1838. *Jakoby* (a preacher of Method. Episc. Church), Handbuch des Methodismus, Bremen 1853, 2te Aufl. 1855. Works and Sermons of Wesley (many ed.). *T. Jackson*, Hist. of Method., Lond. 1838; in Germ., Berlin 1840. [*Isaac Taylor*, Wesley and Meth., Lond. 1851. *Southey's* Life of Wesley, ed. by Rev. *C. C. Southey*, 2 vols. 1847; Life by *Richard Watson*. *Geo. Smith*, Hist. of Wesleyan Methodism, 1857. — The theological system of Wesleyanism is represented in the works of *John Fletcher* and *Richard Watson*. *John Fletcher* (Flechière), born at Nym, Switzerland, 1729, vicar of Madeley, died 1785. Works, 8 vols. 1803. *Richard Watson*, Theological Institutes, 2d ed. 3 vols., Lond. 1824.] His fellow-labourer was *J. G. Whitefield* (died 1770). Works of *Whitefield*, 6 vols., Lond. 1771. Afterwards they separated on account of their different views on grace; Wesley adopting the Arminian, while Whitefield retained the strict Calvinistic theories. Nor did they in all points agree with the Pietists and the United Brethren. These differences may be said to be, that the United Brethren by a onesided presentation of the reconciliation already achieved, and of the experience of grace already attained, worked in a more quiet manner, but exposed to the danger of inactivity;

while Methodism, by constantly urging repentance, had a wholesome moral influence, though it was exposed to the peril of awakening undue terrors in its subjects, and of condemning those that were without. Both tendencies have their common root in pietism, which also reconciles these extreme tendencies.

(8) *Immanuel von Swedenborg* was born 1688, and died 1777; from the year 1743, he considered himself divinely inspired. (Comp. *Herder*, Adrastea, vol. ix. s. 502.) His *principal works* are: Arcana cœlestia, Lond. 1749 ss., 4 vols., ed. *Tafel*, Tub. 1833. Vera Chr. Rel. complect. univ. Theol. Novæ Eccles., Amst. 1771, 2 vols. 4to (repub. London, 1 vol.). In Germany (and especially in Würtemberg) the cause of Swedenborg was espoused first by *Oetinger* (1765), and afterwards by *Tafel* (1838). In modern times the doctrine of Swedenborg has been revived, and has gained adherents in France (*Oegger*) and England. For the most recent literature, compare *Rheinw.*, Repertorium, 1834, Bd. ix. s. 216 ff. Respecting his doctrines, see *Hauber* in the Tübinger Zeitschrift, 1840, 4; on the other side, Swedenborg's Lehre, mit Rücksicht auf die Einwürfe gegen sie (in Swedenborg und seine Gegner, 3 Thl.), Stuttg. 1844. Further, see *Niedner*, Kg. s. 766. [*Ed. Paxton Hood*, Swed., a Biography and Exposition, 1854. *Aug. Clissold*, Practical Nature of the Theol. writings of S., a Letter to the Abp. of Dublin, 1859 (and many other works). *W. White*, Life of Swedenborg, London.]

One aspect of Swedenborgianism (the spirit-seeing) was advocated by *Jung Stilling* (1740–1817), who, together with *J. Casp. Lavater* (1741–1801), exerted himself for the preservation and promotion of the higher interests of religion among many of his contemporaries, especially the educated classes of society. But this mystico-theosophic tendency is not to be confounded with the mysticism of Tauler and others; the former, floating in the prose of the 18th century, and having passed through all its reflective processes, is very different from the mediæval theosophic mysticism, nurtured by the poetry of the earlier periods. Comp. *Baumgarten-Crusius*, Compendium, i. § 185.

§ 279.

The Philosophy of Kant. Rationalism and Supernaturalism.

Rosenkranz, Gesch. der Kantischen Philosophie, Lpz. 1840. *Erdmann*, Die Entwicklung der deutschen Speculation seit Kant, i., Lpz. 1848; comp.

the next section. *Kuno Fischer*, Gesch. d. neueren Phil., Bde. iii. iv. 1860, and Kant's Leben und Lehre, 1860. [*Cousin*, Lectures on Kant, 1832; in English, by Henderson, 1854. *H. L. Mansel*, Lecture on the Philosophy of Kant, 1860, republished in his Miscellanies, Lond. 1873.]

After the indefinite philosophy of the eighteenth century had, for a long time, attempted to reduce religion to mere morality, or at least to resolve all that is specifically Christian into general and abstract ideas of God, liberty, and immortality, with occasional reference to the current biblical doctrines, a new state of things was brought about by the rise of *Kantianism*, or the critical philosophy. This system gave a more definite expression to the previous desultory efforts, and, at the same time, circumscribed them in a wholesome way within the limits of a strictly scientific form. *Immanuel Kant* (1), after the example of Hume, subjected the human intellect to a more searching examination, and found that this faculty, bound to time and space, is unable to fathom the depths of the Deity, can only apprehend the finite, and is therefore competent to supply an adequate rule only for our moral life. While Kant, on the one hand, thus denied to pure reason the power of making any certain statements concerning what is divine (2), on the other he vindicated belief in the existence of God, liberty, and immortality, by representing them as postulates of the practical reason (3). That serious and wise man spoke of the Bible and Christianity with the highest reverence, and admitted that they were designed to be the medium by which the knowledge of these practical ideas was to be generally diffused among the people. Although the number of theologians was small who embraced the critical philosophy in a strictly scientific form (4), such as *Tieftrunk* (5), *Stäudlin* (6) (at least for a time), and *Ammon* (7), it may nevertheless be said, that what is now called *Rationalism* (8), as opposed to *Supernaturalism* (9), had its origin in the results of the critical philosophy of Kant. The representatives of that formal belief in revelation, termed *Supernaturalism*, which differs from the earlier forms

of orthodoxy, were chiefly *Storr* (10) and *Reinhard* (11); the representatives of Rationalism were *Wegscheider* (12), *Paulus* (13), and *Röhr* (14). And lastly, there were some, as *Schott* (15), *Bretschneider* (16), and *Tzschirner* (17), who, by propounding what is called *rational Supernaturalism*, endeavoured to reconcile these two extremes with each other, or, at least, to facilitate such a reconciliation.

(1) *Immanuel Kant* was born 1724, and died 1804 (since the year 1740 he had studied theology). His complete works were edited by *Rosenkranz* and *Schubert*, Lpz. 1837, 12 vols. *Hartenstein*, 10 vols. 1838 ff.

(2) In his *work:* Kritik der reinen Vernunft, Riga 1781; 2d ed. 1787. All later editions were merely reprinted from the second. [Translated into English, var. edd. A new critical German edition, published 1880.]

(3) See his *works:* Kritik der praktischen Vernunft, Riga 1788; Kritik der Urtheilskraft, 1790. Of special importance for *theology* is his work: Die Religion innerhalb der Grenzen der blossen Vernunft, Königsb. 1793, 2d improved ed. 1794. [The first English work on Kant was a General and Introductory View, by *Nitzsch*, Lond. 1796; *Semple*, Kant's Metaphysics of Ethics, 1837.]

(4) Comp. *Flügge*, Versuch einer historisch-kritischen Darstellung des bisherigen Einflusses der Kantischen Philosophie auf alle Zweige der wissenschaftl. und praktischen Theologie, Hannover 1796, 1800, 2 vols. *Reinhard*, Preface to the third edition of his System der christlichen Moral, 1797. *J. F. Flatt*, Obss. ad comparandam doctr. Kant cum christiana, 1792. (Opusc. Nr. 7.) *Kessler*, Darstellung und Prüfung des Kantischen Rationalismus in der Religion, besonders in der Exegese, Würzb. 1818. *Ulrici* on Kant (and *Jacobi*, *Fries*, and *Fichte*), in *Herzog's* Realenc. s.v., and "Religionsphilosophie."

(5) *Johann Heinr. Tieftrunk* lived towards the close of the eighteenth century, and was private lecturer on philosophy in the University of Halle. *He wrote:* Versuch einer Kritik der Religion, 1790.—Censur des christlich-protestantischen Lehrbegriffs, mit besonderer Hinsicht auf die Lehrbücher von

Döderlein und Morus, Berlin 1791–1795, 2d ed. 1796. Dilucidationes ad Theoret. Christ. Rel. Part. 1793, 2 vols.—Religion der Mündigen, 1800.

(6) *K. F. Stäudlin* was born 1761, and died 1826, as professor of theology in the University of Göttingen. *He wrote:* Ideen zur Kritik der christlichen Religion, Gött. 1791. Lehrb. der Dogmatik und Dogmengeschichte, ibid. 1800. 3d ed. 1809, 4th ed. 1822.

(7) *C. F. Ammon,* born 1766, died 1850, was firstly professor of theology in the University of Erlangen, and afterwards court preacher at Dresden. *He wrote:* Entwurf einer wissenschaftlich-praktischen Theologie, nach Grundsätzen der Vernunft und des Christenthums, 1797.—Abhandlungen zur Erläuterung einer wissenschaftlich-praktischen Theologie, 1798. Summa Theol. Christ. 1803 (translated into German, 1805), 4th ed. 1830. Ausführlicher Unterricht in der chrislichen Glaubenslehre, für Freunde der evangelischen Wahrheit, 1807.

(8) The term *Rationalism* was employed previously to the rise of the Kantian philosophy, and frequently used in the same sense as Naturalism and Deism. Comp. the sect of the Rationalists in England (§ 238, note 3), and *Sucro,* Disputatio de Estimatione Rationis humanæ theologica, 1706, p. 8: Hinc tantus undique numerus *Rationalistarum,* Naturalistarum, Libertinorum, Scepticorum, quin imo Atheorum; and p. 32: His *Rationalistis* totus mundus refertus est (quoted by *Tholuck,* ii. s. 25, 26). Nevertheless many still confound these terms, some intentionally, others unintentionally. They were separated by Kant himself (Religion innerhalb der Grenzen der blossen Vernunft, s. 216 f.). It may also be said that we have a historical right to make a distinction between that Rationalism which has been systematically developed in Germany, and for more than half a century has exerted, and still exerts, upon the Church an influence more or less considerable, although not always for good, and that daring and frivolous Naturalism, which has its advocates not so much in the Church as in the world. German Rationalism has, at least, retained an historical and scriptural Christianity, and by making use of ecclesiastical institutions, *e.g.* by preaching, has endeavoured to

promote the spread of moral and religious principles, especially in opposition to pantheistic tendencies, which threaten to destroy all sense of morality. Thus we may be permitted, in due acknowledgment of its merits, to speak of a *Christian* Rationalism. Some writers have employed the phrase *rationalismus vulgaris*, to distinguish it from its modern forms of development, which have not been recognized by its adherents. Comp. *Bretschneider*, Historische Bemerkungen über den Gebrauch der Ausdrücke Rationalismus und Supranaturalismus (Oppositions-schriften, vii. 1, 1829). *A. Hahn*, De Rationalismi qui dicitur vera Indole, Lips. 1827. *K. Hase*, Die Leipzigerdisputation, Leipz. 1827.—By *the same:* Streitschriften, i. s. 28; Dogmatik, s. 16, 36.—Some very excellent remarks may also be found in *Baumgarten-Crusius*, Compendium, i. s. 476.

(9) In one aspect the advocates of supernaturalism themselves might adopt the principles of Kant, inasmuch as he had demonstrated the insufficiency of reason to discover divine things. This was done by *Storr* in his Bemerkungen über Kant's philosophische Religionslehre, translated from the Latin by *Süsskind*, Tüb. 1794 (see *Baumgarten-Crusius*, i. s. 466). But Kant did not draw the inference that therefore a revelation must be necessary *because* reason is insufficient; on the contrary, he rather set it aside, by denying to reason the power of setting up any other than a moral criterion by which to ascertain whether anything has been revealed. Revelation was to him problematical, and positive religion was merely the vehicle by which the practical truths of reason are communicated. Compare the Special History of Doctrines.

(10) *Gottl. Chr. Storr* was born 1746, and died 1805, as professor in the University of Tübingen. Among his *works* were: Doctrinæ Christianæ Pars Theoretica, 1793. Lehrbuch der christlichen Dogmatik, ins Deutsche übersetzt mit Erläuterungen von *C. Ch. Flatt*, 1803. On the conservative tendency of the school of Tübingen, see *Tholuck*, ii. s. 145–147. [*Storr and Flatt*, Bibl. Theology; in Eng., Lond. 1836.]

(11) *Franz Volkmar Reinhard* was born 1753, and died 1812, as first court preacher (chaplain) at Dresden. *Works:* Geständnisse, Sulzb. 1810. Epitome Theol. Christ. e F. V. Reinhardi acroasibus academ. descript. atque obss. auct. (ed.

Hoepfner), 1805. Vorlesungen über Dogmatik, mit literar. Zusätzen herausgeg. von *F. B. Berger* (1801), and *H. A. Schott*, Sulzb. 1818. The supernaturalism of Reinhard is ethical and intellectual, and had its origin partly in a fine conscientiousness, partly in strictly logical inferences which he drew from certain philosophical premisses. Its fundamental principle was not very different from that of Rationalism; and the sermons of Reinhard, which are distinguished by a prevailing moralizing treatment of Scripture, have served as models for many rationalistic discourses. Pure biblical Supernaturalism, unmixed with ecclesiastical tradition or philosophical principles, is represented in the following works: *A. Hahn*, Lehrbuch des christlichen Glaubens, Leipz. 1828 (1858, 1859); *G. Ch. Knapp*, Vorlesungen über die christliche Glaubenslehre, nach dem Lehrbegriff der evang. Kirche, herausgegeben von *G. Thilo*, Halle 1827 (translated by *Leonard Woods*, and frequently republished); and Biblische Glaubenslehre, vornehmlich für den praktischen Gebrauch, herausgegeben von *Guericke*, Halle 1840.

(12) *J. A. L. Wegscheider*, born 1771, died 1848, from the year 1810 professor of theology in the University of Halle. *He wrote:* Institutiones Theologiæ Christianæ dogmaticæ, 1813 (8th ed. 1844). He was opposed by *W. Steiger*, Kritik des Rationalismus in Wegscheiders Dogmatik, Berlin 1830.

(13) *H. E. G. Paulus*, born 1761, died 1851, at Heidelberg (formerly at Jena), as professor and ecclesiastical councillor. He endeavoured to promote Rationalism by exegetical works (*e.g.* Commentar über das Neue Testament.—Leben Jesu), and by advocating liberal principles in some of his writings, *e.g.* Sophronizon, 1818 ff. Der Denkgläubige, 1825, 1829.

(14) *J. F. Röhr*, born 1777, died 1848, as General Superintendent at Weimar. *He wrote:* Briefe über den Rationalismus, zur Berichtigung der schwankenden und zweideutigen Urtheile, die in den neuesten dogmatischen Consequenzstreitigkeiten über denselben gefällt worden sind, Sonderhausen 1813.—From the year 1820 he edited the "Kritische Predigerbibliothek" (Critical Journal for Ministers). He further published: Grund- und Glaubenssätze der evangelisch-protestantischen Kirche, Neust. 1832, 1834, and Sermons.

(15) *H. A. Schott*, born 1780, died 1835, as professor of theology in the University of Jena. *He wrote:* Epitome Theolog. Dogmaticæ, Lips. 1811, 1822.

(16) *K. G. Bretschneider*, born 1776, died 1848, as General Superintendent in Gotha. *He wrote:* Handbuch der Dogmatik der evangel.-luther. Kirche, Leipz. 1814, 1818, 2 vols., 4th ed. 1838. Systematische Entwicklung aller in der Dogmatik vorkommenden Begriffe, nach den symb. Büchern der prot. luth. Kirche, ibid. 1805, latest ed. 1841. (His tendency is chiefly historical.)

(17) *H. G. Tzschirner*, born 1778, died 1828, as professor of theology and superintendent at Leipzig. *He wrote:* Vorlesungen über die christl. Glaubenslehre nach dem Lehrbegriffe der evang.-protest. Kirche, edited by *K. Hase*, Leipz. 1829. (In this work the two systems of Rationalism and Supernaturalism are co-ordinately developed.)

A striking parallel may be drawn between the rationalistic system of Kant (as well as the earlier system of Wolf) on the one hand, and the development of literature on the other. The period of Schiller (his poem: Worte des Glaubens), compared with the poem of Urania by *Tiedge* (1801). The same tendency manifested itself in works of a popular character (in homiletical literature, in religious books, and in works designed for the young), *e.g.* in the works entitled: Stunden der Andacht (*i.e.* Hours of Devotion) [by *Zschokke:* partially transl. into Eng. by order of Queen Victoria, under the title: Meditations on Death and Eternity], and its effect in *Dinters* Schullehrerbibel (*i.e.* the Schoolmaster's Bible, edit. by Dinter).

§ 280.

Modern Speculative Philosophy. Fichte. Schelling.

C. M. Michelet, Geschichte der Philosophie von Kant bis Hegel, Berlin 1837, 2 vols. *H. M. Chalybäus*, Historische Entwicklung der speculativen Philosophie von Kant bis Hegel, Dresd. 1837, 3d ed. 1843 [5th ed. 1860. Translated into Eng., Edin. 1857]. *C. Fortlage*, Genetische Geschichte der Philosophie seit Kant, Leipz. 1852. [*J. D. Morell*, Historical and Critical View of the Speculative Philosophy of the Nineteenth Century, 2 vols. *Bartholmess*, Les Doctrines religieuses de la Philosophie Allemande, 1856, 2 vols. *O. Pfleiderer*, Religionsphilosophie, Berlin 1878.]

During the period in which the philosophy of Kant prevailed, Rationalism and Supernaturalism occupied common

ground in this, that the mode of thinking adopted by their adherents was abstract, and circumscribed by the categories of the understanding. It was not until the rise of the modern system of speculative philosophy, in the *Idealism of Fichte* (1), and afterwards in the more developed form of *Schelling's* Philosophy of the *Absolute* (2), that attention was again directed to that which was most profound and significant in the doctrines of Christianity, *i.e.* in the first place, to their speculative import; thus leading thinking minds from the mere periphery of religious life back to its centre. The Rationalists and Supernaturalists, attaching too much importance to the empirical and practical aspect of religion, had lost sight of its deeper speculative aspect. The opposite tendency now showed itself. The founders of this new esoteric Gnosis introduced an enigmatic phraseology, which appeared to their contemporaries as a sort of hieroglyphic language. To formulas, orthodox in sound, they attached a sense different from that contained in the doctrines of the Church, and sometimes even incompatible with practical religious truth. Not only was history converted into a mere mythical garb for speculative ideas, but *Kant's* Trias of *God, Liberty, and Immortality*, in which the Rationalists had hitherto believed in their honest sobriety, must needs vanish in the presence of that *Pantheism*, which annihilates the personality of God and of man, and confounds the Divine Being with the world. So that, while some were rejoicing at the return of what they considered a Christian philosophy, others questioned the advantage of this exchange of Rationalism for the speculative philosophy (3).

(1) *J. C. Fichte*, born 1762, died 1814, as professor of philosophy in the University of Berlin. In the development of his system, different periods may be pointed out. In his Versuch einer Kritik aller Offenbarung (1792), which was first published anonymously, and for a time ascribed to Kant, he took the same ground which had long been occupied by the latter. But his Wissenschaftslehre (1794 ff.) is altogether speculative-idealistic; it is a question, whether the principles

set forth in it are really or only apparently atheistic. On account of its purely speculative shape, it was unfitted to be directly applied to theology. In his later writings (composed in a more popular style) Fichte endeavoured to express himself in a more Christian manner, and to show the agreement existing between his own principles and those of Christianity. This is the case especially in his Anweisung zum seligen Leben, oder die Religionslehre (Berlin 1806): in this work he attaches, in opposition to a moralizing Rationalism, the greatest importance to the fourth Gospel, and founds his system on the unity of the Father with the Son (whom he regards as God attaining to a consciousness of Himself in man). Compare *Joh. Bapt. Schad* (a Benedictine of Banz), Gemeinfassliche Darstellung des Fichte'schen und der daraus hervorgehenden Religionstheorie, Erf. 1800–1802, 3 vols., and *Baumgarten-Crusius*, i. s. 455–457. *K. Hase*, Jenaisches Fichtebüchlein, Lpz. 1856. [*Fichte's* Characteristics of the Present age, Nature of the Scholar, Vocation of Men, and Vocation of the Scholar, with other works, transl. into English by *Smith*, with a Memoir, London.] *J. F. Erdmann*, Fichte, der Mann der Wissenschaft u. des Katheders, Halle 1862. *Kym*, Gedächtnissrede, Zürich 1862.

(2) *F. W. Jos. von Schelling*, born 1775, called in 1841 from Munich to be professor of philosophy in the University of Berlin, died 1854. He endeavoured to reconcile the Idealism of Fichte with Realism (subject and object) by the mediating philosophy of identity (after the manner of Spinoza). Comp. his Vorlesungen über die Methode des akademischen Studiums, Stuttg. und Tüb. 1803, 1813, especially Lecture 8 (On the historical construction of Christianity) and Lecture 9 (On the study of theology). He there states, in opposition to the Rationalism of Kant (s. 180), that the doctrines "*of the incarnate God*" and (s. 184) of "*the reconciliation of the finite which had fallen from God*," are the first elements of Christianity, completed and perfected in the doctrine of the *Trinity;* this doctrine, however, "is *absurd*, unless it be considered in its *speculative aspect*" (s. 192). The whole of Lecture 9 contains a definite attack upon (empirical) Supernaturalism, as also upon Rationalism (Kant's), and lastly, the *historical* conception of Christianity.—He further wrote: Philosophie und

Religion, Tüb. 1804. Denkmal der Schrift von den göttlichen Dingen des Herrn F. J. Jacobi (comp. § 281), Tüb. 1812.—In the later period of his life, Schelling manifested a stronger leaning towards positive Christianity and theistic views; see his preface to *Victor Cousin*, translated from the French by *Beckers*, Stutt. 1834. Comp. *A. Planck*, Schellings Nachgelassene Werke und ihre Bedeutung für die Theologie (Deutsche Zeitschrift für Christl. Wiss. viii., März. 1857).—The disciples of Schelling at first cultivated the science of natural philosophy, rather than the philosophy of religion and of theology. His philosophy was applied to theology by *Heinrich Blasche* (died 1832): Das Böse, im Einklange mit der Weltordnung dargestellt, Leipz. 1827, and Philosophie der Offenbarung, Gotha 1829. As regards the relation in which *Eschenmayer* stands to the philosophy of Schelling, see *Reinhold*, Geschichte der Philosophie, ii. 2, s. 388. It must also be admitted that the philosophical tendencies of *Schleiermacher* were connected with those of Schelling, though he applied them to religion and theology in a very different manner, more like that of *Jacobi* (see § 281). [*Schelling's* Sämmtliche Werke, the second division, 4 vols., contains his Lectures.] Comp. *Dorner*, Schellings Potenzlehre (Jahrbb. f. deutsche Theologie, 1860, s. 101–156). *E. A. Weber*, Examen critique de la Philos. religieuse de Schelling, Strasb. 1860.

(3) Comp. his controversy with *Jacobi*. *F. Köppen*, Schellings Lehre, oder das Ganze der Lehre vom absoluten Nichts, Hamb. 1803. *G. F. Süsskind*, Prüfung der Schellingschen Lehre von Gott, Weltschöpfung, moralischer Freiheit, etc., Tüb. 1812. *Ehrenfeuchter*, Schellings Philosophie der Mythologie u. Offenbarung (Jahrb. f. d. Theol. 1859, 2), and the article "Schelling," by *Heyder*, in *Herzog's* Realenc. xiii. s. 503 ff.

Here again is a parallel in literature and art. The Romantic tendency (the brothers *Schlegel*, *Tieck*, *Novalis*), *Goethe* (viewed in contrast with Schiller), *Creuzer* and *Voss*, Symbolik und Antisymbolik.

§ 281.

Herder and Jacobi. De Wette and Schleiermacher.

Although the speculative philosophy of Fichte and Schelling seemed to have brought about a certain reconciliation between the two extremes above mentioned, it was still to be seen whether that reconciliation was a real one. *Herder*, in the spirit of a poet (1), pointed out the historical nature of the Christian doctrines, as well as the distinction between religion and doctrinal opinions, and opened the way, in connection with modern culture, to a new and living treatment of scriptural subjects, founded on more accurate views of Oriental and Biblical modes of thought. On the other hand, the philosophy of the Absolute was combated by the pious and sagacious *Friedrich Jacobi* (2). In opposition to this philosophy, he endeavoured to show that faith, which he distinguished from knowledge, must have its quiet home in the human heart. Although he did not mean by faith either the faith of the Church, or strict scriptural faith (in the supranaturalistic sense), his more believing and prophetic theory was welcomed, even by those who felt the necessity of a more positive system. The philosophical system of Jacobi, designed to meet the religious feelings of men, served as the basis of a new theological school, the adherents of which are also disposed to adopt the principles of modern philosophy in general (3). They endeavoured to bring about a reconciliation between the extremes, by historico-critical as well as philosophical researches, by psychologico-anthropological rather than by the objective way of speculative investigations. As its founders, we may regard *De Wette* (4) and *Schleiermacher* (5), though in different ways. The former laboured to show, in a psychological and synthetic way, the symbolical religious value of the historical doctrines of Christianity in their relation to the souls of believers; the latter endeavoured,

in an analytical and dialectic manner, to apprehend in Christianity that which is peculiar to itself, and to represent the doctrines of the Church as the perpetual expression of the feelings common to all believers.

(1) *Johann Gottfried von Herder,* born 1744, died 1803, as General Superintendent at Weimar. Among his numerous *works* are: Werke zur Religion und Theologie, Tüb. 1805 ff. 12 vols. Though Herder did not publish a system of theology, by his enlightened views (misunderstood by many) he is of the highest importance in reference to theology. Among his theological works the following are of special significance: Briefe über das Studium der Theologie, Brief 29 ff.; Christliche Schriften (vom Erlöser der Menschen; von Gottes Sohn, der Welt Heiland; vom Geist des Christenthums; von Religion, Lehrmeinungen, und Gebräuchen).— The theological views of Herder are given in a collective form in J. G. von Herder's Dogmatik, aus dessen Schriften dargestellt und mit literarischen und kritischen Anmerkungen versehen von einem Freunde der Herderschen Gnosis (*Augusti?*), Jena 1805. Comp. Herder-Album, Jena 1845; Herder's Lebensbild, von seinem Sohne, Erlangen 1846, 2 vols.; and *Hagenbach,* in *Herzog's* Realenc., on *Herder's* philosophical tendency; *Erdmann,* G. Herder als Religionsphilosoph, Hersfeld 1866.

(2) *Friedrich Jacobi,* born 1743, was from the year 1804 President of the Academy of Sciences in Munich, died 1819. His complete *works* were published, Leipz. 1812, 6 vols.; his correspondence, Leipz. 1825–1827, 2 vols. Compare his Von den göttlichen Dingen und ihrer Offenbarung, Leipz. 1811, and *J. Kuhn,* Jacobi und die Philosophie seiner Zeit, Mainz 1824. *H. Fricker,* Die Philos. des F. H. Jacobi, Augsb. 1854.

(3) Schleiermacher acknowledged that he derived his first impulse from Jacobi (*Baumg.* i. s. 468); Schelling also exerted some influence upon him. On the other hand, De Wette adhered to the principles of *Fries,* who endeavoured to complete the philosophy of Kant on the principles of Jacobi; the three terms he uses are knowledge, faith, longing (*Ahnung*).

(4) *W. M. Leberecht de Wette,* born 1780, professor of

theology in the University of Berlin from the year 1810 to 1819, from 1821 professor of theology in the University of Basel, died 1849. His theological opinions are developed in his: Erläuterungen zum Lehrbuch der Dogmatik, über Religion und Theologie, Berlin 1821.—Lehrbuch der christlichen Dogmatik in ihrer historischen Entwicklung, Berl. 1821, 2 vols. 3d ed. 1840.—Christliche Sittenlehre, ibid. 1819–1824, 3 vols. The following are written in a popular style: Ueber die religion, ihr Wesen, ihre Erscheinungsformen und ihren Einfluss auf das Leben (a course of public lectures), Berl. 1827.—Theodor oder des Zweiflers Weihe, 1821, 1828, 2 vols.—Sermons.—*Das Wesen des christl. Glaubens, vom Standpunkte des Glaubens dargestellt, Basel 1846. Comp. *Schenkel*, De Wette und die Bedeutung seiner Theologie für unsere Zeit; *Hagenbach*, W. M. L. de Wette, eine akademische Gedächtnissrede, 1850; *Lücke*, W. M. L. de Wette, Hamb. 1850. *Hagenbach* in *Herzog's* Realenc. xviii. s. 61.

(5) *Friedrich Schleiermacher*, born 1768, died 1834, as professor of theology in the University of Berlin. Among his works are: Ueber Religion, Reden an die Gebildeten unter ihren Verächtern, Berlin 1799. (This work in its first form has but slight reference to positive Christianity: it rather favours the suspicion of pantheism; but he already views religion as essentially a feeling, in distinction from knowledge or action; the later editions (4th, 1829) in the notes indicate the transition from these discourses to the standpoint of his Christian Dogmatics.)—Darstellung des theologischen Studiums, Berlin 1811, 1830.—Der christliche Glaube, nach den Grundsätzen der evangelischen Kirche im Zusammenhange dargestellt, Berl. 1821, 1830, 2 vols.—Sermons. (An edition of his entire works was commenced 1834, in three divisions [1. Theology; 2. Sermons; 3. Philosophy; about 30 vols. published].) Comp. *H. Braniss*, Ueber Schleiermachers Glaubenslehre, Berlin 1822. *H. Schmid*, Ueber Schleiermachers Glaubenslehre, Leipz. 1835. *K. Rosenkranz*, Kritik der Schleiermacherschen Glaubenslehre, Königsb. 1836. *G. Weissenborn*, Darstellung u. Kritik der Schleierm. Dogmatik, Lpz. 1849. *Baumgarten-Crusius*, Schleiermachers Denkart und Verdienst, Jena 1834. *Lücke* (Studien und Kritiken, 1834, 4). *Strauss*, Schleiermacher und Daub, in the

Halle'sche Jahrbücher, 1834, Nr. 20 (reprinted in *Strauss'* "Charakteristiken und Kritiken," 1839). [Comp. also *Strauss* in his Der alte u. der neue Glaube.] *Auberlen*, Schleiermacher ein Charakterbild, Basel 1859. *Gass* in *Herzog's* Realenc. xiii. s. 741 ff.[1]

[Translations of Schleiermacher's Essay on Luke, by *C. Thirwall* (while still a student of law), Lond. 1825; Outlines of Study of Theology, by *Farrer*, Edinb. 1850. The theology of Schleiermacher made an epoch, in consequence of its peculiar relation to the two opposite systems of rationalism and supernaturalism, in the midst of whose conflicts it appeared. It "combines the elements of both, in representing the essence of Christianity to be the immediate utterance of the religious consciousness, which in its inmost spirit, it says, is Christian." This Christian consciousness "has, on the one hand, whatever is essential in Christianity; while, on the other hand, it is viewed as only the more definite explication and concrete expression of what is inherent in man's religious nature." The same general tendency of thought represented by Kant is also developed in Schleiermacher's system; but this is only one of its aspects. The other aspect is, "that what makes the substance of the Christian consciousness is not something which it produces, by and of itself, but something imparted and received. The Christian consciousness is the reflex and expression of the Christian fellowship." See *Baur*, Dogmengeschichte, s. 353, 2d ed.]

§ 282.

Attempts at Restoration. Practical Piety and Modern Theology.

But this reconciliation, which could be appreciated only by the educated classes of society, did not meet the wants of

[1] For the genesis of Schleiermacher's System, see his Correspondence with *J. Ch. Gass*, with a biographical preface by *Dr. W. Gass*, Berl. 1852. Comp. also his autobiography (in his 26th year), published by *Lommatzsch* in the Zeitschrift f. d. hist. Theol. 1851; and *Gelzer's* Monatsblätter, vi., on Schleiermacher and the United Brethren, a contribution to the internal history of German Protestantism. [*W. Dilthey*, Leben Schleiermachers, Berlin 1870. Only vol. i. published.]

Christians at large. Although the conflict between Rationalism and Supernaturalism at first appeared to be confined to the schools, a general desire after more substantial spiritual food soon manifested itself among the people, for a long time indifferent to their religious interests, but now aroused by the signs of the times. Instead of the timid Supernaturalism of the schools, itself not affected by Rationalism, the ancient faith boldly raised its voice against modern culture. *Claus Harms*, on the occasion of the centenary of the German Reformation, published a number of theses, in which he proclaimed the necessity of returning to the old Lutheran faith, and proved that the religion of reason is worthless (1). *Sartorius* pointed out the close relation existing between Rationalism and Romanism (2). The controversy raged with violence, both parties denouncing each other (3). But the prevailing practical tendency of the age, which manifested itself in the spread of the Scriptures and of religion, and in the founding of religious societies (4), prevented some of the evils which had been expected from these contests. Nor was the progress of scientific theology neglected; on the contrary, it is grateful to see that the nobler interests of science were elevated above these party conflicts. Commentators, as well as the writers on Church history, obtained a clearer perception of the necessity of guarding against dogmatic prejudices on the one hand, and, on the other, of entering into more profound researches as to the real nature of their topics, and of handling these subjects as living forms, instead of setting up dead schemes (5). The distinguishing principles of the various denominations, the consideration of which had long been neglected from want of interest, were now more fully and scientifically discussed in the works on Symbolism (6). Christian Ethics was brought into closer connection with systematic theology (7), the whole of theological science was regarded from new points of view (8), and the way was prepared for a total reformation in practical theology (9).

(1) *Claus Harms*, born 1778, was professor of theology in the University of Kiel, died 1855 (comp. *Rheinwald*, Repertorium, xxx. s. 54; his Autobiography, Kiel 1851; *Baumgarten*, Denkmal für Claus Harms, Braunschw. 1855; *Pelt* in *Herzog's* Realenc. v. s. 567). The title of the work referred to is: Das sind die 95 Theses oder Streitsätze Dr. Luthers, zum besondern Abdruck besorgt, und mit andern 95 Sätzen vermehrt, Kiel 1817. On the controversy to which it gave rise, see the Evangelische Kirchenzeitung, 1829, Nr. 45–48, 58–60, 80 ff., 88 ff. (Both *Ammon* and *Schleiermacher* took part in it.) Afterwards he wrote: "Dass es mit der Vernunftreligion nichts ist," Leipz. 1819, to which *Krug* replied in his treatise: "Dass es mit der Vernunftreligion doch etwas ist." [Among these keen Theses of Harms are the following: 2. A progressive Reformation, as now understood, reforms Lutheranism into heathenism, and Christianity out of the world. 5. The Pope of our times, our Antichrist, in respect to faith, is Reason; in respect to action, is Conscience. 11. Conscience cannot forgive sins. 21. In the sixteenth century, forgiveness of sins cost money; in the nineteenth we have it for nothing; we do it ourselves. 24. The old hymn-book says: "Thou hast two places before thee, O man!" Now-a-days, the devil is killed, and hell walled up. 32. The so-called rational religion is either without religion, or without reason, or without both. 33. It says the moon is the sun. 42. The relation of the so-called natural religion to revealed is like the relation of nothing to something, or else like the relation of revealed religion to revealed religion.]—*Baumgarten-Crusius* wrote against Harms, XCV. Theses Theologiæ contra Superstitionem et Profanationem. *Schröder*, Archiv d. Harms'schen Thesen, oder Charakteristik der Schriften die für oder gegen dieselben erschienen sind, Altona 1818.

(2) *E. W. Ch. Sartorius*, born 1797, professor of theology in the University of Königsberg, then at Dorpat, died 1859. *He wrote:* Die Religion ausserhalb der Grenzen der blossen Vernunft, nach den Grundsätzen des wahren Protestantismus gegen die eines falschen Rationalismus, Marb. 1822. Comp. also *Heinr. Steffens*, Von der falschen Theologie und dem wahren Glauben, eine Stimme aus der Gemeinde, Breslau 1823.

(3) The Rationalists charged the Supernaturalists (Pietists, mystics) with anti-Protestant tendencies; the Supernaturalists demanded in their turn, that their opponents should secede from the Church, and sometimes insisted upon their expulsion. —The Disputation of Leipzig, 1827. (Comp. *Hase*, Die Leipz. Disputation, 1827.)—The Evangelische Kirchenzeitung, edited by *Hengstenberg*, took a prominent part in this controversy.— Respecting the denunciations of Halle, and other events, see *Hase*, Kg. § 466 (444).

(4) These were the Bible Societies and Missionary Societies which, after the example given by England, were established on the Continent, *e.g.* in Basel 1816, Berlin 1823.—They are the most eloquent apologists!—The advocates of mere negative principles only criticize, but do not produce anything.

(5) After exegesis, subsequently to the time of *Ernesti* (though often in an arbitrary method), had again become the servant of theological opinions (thus in the case of *Storr* and *Paulus*), *Winer* advocated the claims of the grammatico-historical interpretation, while *Lücke* (in his commentaries on the writings of John) prepared the way for a dynamic and penetrating system of interpretation. Church history, which formerly had often been regarded as the history of human follies, was treated with laudable impartiality by *Gieseler*, and proved by *Neander* [David Mendel] to indicate the development of the kingdom of God on earth. It is worthy of observation, that the newly awakened historical tendency also manifested itself in many monographs on historical subjects. These and other circumstances contributed to a more scientific treatment of systematic theology, and helped to frighten away the ghosts on both sides.

(6) *Marheinecke* and *Winer*, etc., see above, § 14.

(7) *De Wette* pointed out many defects in the treatment of Christian ethics in his Kritische Uebersicht der Ausbildung der theologischen Sittenlehre seit Calixt (Theol. Zeitschrift, Berlin 1819, s. 247 ff.).—Christian ethics were treated in connection with systematic theology by *C. I. Nitzsch*, System der christlichen Lehre, Bonn 1829, 6th ed. 1852 [transl. in Clark's For. Theol. Library, Edinb.], and *J. T. Beck*, Die christliche Lehrwissenschaft nach den biblischen Urkunden, Stuttg. 1840, i. 1; 1841, i. 2.

(8) From the time of *Schleiermacher*, Theological Encyclopædia was made a separate branch of theological science, which had its effect also on doctrinal theology.

(9) *Schleiermacher*, and after him *Nitzsch*, *Marheinecke*, *Alex. Schweizer*, *Vinet*, *Gaup*, *Ehrenfeuchter*, *Palmer*, *Zezschwitz*, and others, applied scientific treatment to practical theology. This involved a gain for the practical interests of dogmatic theology.

§ 283.

The Philosophy of Hegel, and the young Hegelians.

J. H. Fichte, Ueber Gegensatz, Wendepunkt, und Ziel heut. Philosophie, Heidelb. 1832. *Leo*, Die Hegelingen, Halle 1838. *Zeller's* Theol. Jahrbb. (since 1842). *C. A. Thilo*, Die Wissenschaftlichkeit der modernen speculativen Theologie in ihren Principien beleuchtet, Leipz. 1851. *Zeller*, Die Tübinger histor. Schule in *Sybels* histor. Zeitschrift, 1860, and the art. "Tübinger Schule," by *Landerer*, in *Herzog*, xvi. s. 485 ff. [*R. W. Mackay*, The Tübingen School and its Antecedents, Lond. 1863.]

Nor did philosophy stand still. The theory of Schelling, first applied to the natural world, with a preponderance of the imaginative element, was transplanted by *Hegel's* (1) dialectic method, in a more definite manner, to the historical and ethical sphere, and was thus brought into a closer connection with the theology of Protestant Germany. The highest place was assigned to the *idea* even in religion, while feelings and abstract conceptions were deferred to a lower province. Here was the principal difference between the system of Hegel and that of Schleiermacher. During the lifetime of the founder of this new philosophical school, *Daub* (2) and *Marheinecke* (3) were the only two theologians who decidedly adopted his principles. But after the master's death his views gained a large number of adherents in the rising generation, among whom, however, so great a difference obtained respecting some of the most important theological questions, that they soon separated into two distinct parties. The one, called the right wing of the school of Hegel (4), advocates supranaturalistic,

or theistic and conservative principles, while the tendency of the other (the left) (5) is of a critical and destructive character. In addition to these there are some others, philosophers as well as theologians, who have struck out a new and independent path for themselves, as well in the philosophical (6) as in the theological sphere (7). However much these writers differ in their tendencies (8) (to describe which more fully belongs to doctrinal theology, in connection with the philosophy of religion), they for the most part agree in discarding the former antagonism between Rationalism and Supernaturalism, in having regard to the demands of a spirit of inquiry, as well as the wants of faith, and in investigating in a more appreciative manner the doctrines received by the Church. Nor do they rest satisfied either with appealing to foreign authority, or with a superficial and partial judgment. And herein is the guarantee amid all wanderings and perplexities for the success of these endeavours.

(1) *Georg Friedrich Wilhelm Hegel*, born 1770, was, from the year 1818, professor of philosophy in the University of Berlin, and died 1831. His collected *works* were published, Berlin 1832–1840, 18 in 21 vols. Among them are: Phänomenologie des Geistes, Bamb. 1807. Encyklopädie der philosophischen Wissenschaften, Heidelb. 1817, 4th ed. 1845. Vorlesungen über die Philosophie der Religion, edited by *Marheinecke*, Berlin 1832, 2 vols.—He also wrote a remarkable preface to *Hinrichs'* Religionsphilosophie, 1822 (in respect to the religious sentiment).—Concerning the latest controversies, see *H. Leo*, die Hegelingen, Halle 1838, 1839. *Kahnis*, Ruge und Hegel, Quedl. 1838. *Rheinwald*, Repertorium, xxxi. s. 28 ff. [In English, Philosophy of History, by *Sibree*, in Bohn's Library, 1857; Subjective Logic, by *Sloman* and *Wallon*, 1855. In French, Aesthetics, by *Bénard*, 5 vols. 1840–1852; Logic, 2 vols., by *A. Véra*, 1860, who also in 1855 published an introduction à la Philosophie de Hegel, the fullest account of his system outside Germany.] Among the chief criticisms of his theory in Germany are the later works of *Schelling*; *H. Ulrici*, Ueber Princip und

Methode der Hegelschen Philosophie, 1841; *A. Trendelenburg*, Die logische Frage in Hegel's System, and Logische Untersuchungen, 1840; *G. A. Gabler*, Die Hegelsche Philosophie, 1833; *C. H. Weisse*, Ueber den gegenwärtigen Standpunkt der phil. Wissenschaft, and in other works; *Rosenkranz*, Die logische Idee, 1859, 1860; *Erdmann* in Gesch. d. neueren Philos. [The Hegelian school was represented by the Jahrbücher f. wissenschaftliche Kritik, 1827 sq.; the left wing, by *Ruge* and the Hallische Jahrbücher, 1838.] Comp. also *Ulrici*, art. "Hegel'sche Religionsphilos.," in *Herzog's* Realenc. v. s. 629 ff.

(2) *Karl Daub*, born 1765, was professor of theology and ecclesiastical councillor at Heidelberg, and died 1836. He had passed through the entire development of modern philosophy from Kant to Hegel. His *works* were published by *Marheinecke* and *Dittenberger*, Berl. 1838 ff. We mention: Theologumena s. doctrinæ de Relig. Christ. ex Natura Dei perspecta repetendæ Capita potiora, Heidelb. 1806. Einleitung in das Studium der Dogmatik, aus dem Standpunkte der Religion, ibid. 1810. Judas Ischariot, oder das Böse im Verhältnisse zum Guten betrachtet, 3 parts, ibid. 1816–1819. Die dogmatische Theologie jetziger Zeit, oder die Selbstsucht in der Wissenschaft des Glaubens (ibid. 1833). System der christlichen Dogmatik (first part), edit. by *Marheinecke* and *Dittenberger*, Berlin 1841. Comp. (*Strauss*) Daub und Schleiermacher in his Charakteristiken u. Kritiken, Lpz. 1839. *Rosenkranz*, Erinnerungen an K. Daub, Berlin 1837. Among the disciples of Daub (in part, too, of Schleiermacher) a new path in theology has been struck out by *Richard Rothe* of Heidelberg, in his Theologische Ethik, Wittenb. 1845, 2 vols. (Compare his articles Zur Dogmatik, in the Studien und Kritiken, 1859, 1860) [published since his death as the first part of a system of Dogmatik, with continuation, in 4 vols.; see his memoir prefixed to vol. i. of his *Predigten*, and his life, by *Nippold*, in 2 vols.].

(3) *Philip Marheinecke* [or *Marheinecke*], born 1780, was professor of theology in the University of Berlin, and died 1846. *He wrote:* Grundlinien der christlichen Dogmatik als Wissenschaft, Berlin 1819, 1827. Theol. Vorlesungen, ed. by *Matthies* und *Vatke*, Berlin 1847 ff., 5 vols.

(4) *Gabler, Göschel, Rosenkranz, Schaller, Rothe,* etc. See *Thilo,* l.c.

(5) *D. F. Strauss,* Die christliche Glaubenslehre in ihrer geschichtlichen Entwicklung und im Kampfe mit der modernen Wissenschaft dargestellt, Stuttg. 1840, 1841, 2 vols. Comp. *K. Ph. Fischer,* Die speculative Dogmatik von Strauss, erster Band, geprüft, Tub. 1841. *Thilo,* l.c. *Rosenkranz,* Kritik d. Strauss'schen Glaubenslehre, Leipz. 1845. *Kahnis,* Die moderne Wissenschaft des Dr. Strauss, and die wissenschaftliche Basis der Strauss'schen Dogmatik, 1842. In more recent times, this tendency has been most ably advocated by Tübingen, as represented by *Ferdinand Christian Baur,* born 1792, died 1860, at first a disciple of Schleiermacher, and by degrees applying the principles of the Hegelian system to the reconstruction of Christian history and of Christian doctrines, rather than to the subject of systematic theology, and his disciples have called themselves the "historical school." [Among his works are Christian Gnosis, 1835; replies to Möhler's Symbolik, 1836 ff.; History of the Trinity, 3 vols. 1843–1845; History of the Atonement, 1838; History of Doctrines, 1847, 1858.] *Schwegler, Zeller,* and *Hilgenfeld* are his chief disciples. Comp. *Baur's* work on the Tübingen School, 2d ed. 1860, and *Karl Hase,* Die Tübinger Schule, 1855. *A. Hilgenfeld,* Das Urchristenthum, and Einleitung zum N. T. *R. W. Mackay,* u. s. The action of this school, and the opposition it has provoked, have powerfully influenced the course of religious and theological ideas in the present age, and this influence is still felt.

(6) Among those who lived during the period of Kant and Fichte we may mention *Reinhold, Herbart, Fries, Krug, Koppen, Eschenmayer, Bouterwek,* and others; in modern times, *G. Ritter, J. H. Fichte, C. H. Weisse, K. Ph. Fischer, Billroth, Erdmann, Drobisch,* and others. The school of Herbart is contending with that of Hegel for supremacy, on the opposite (viz. a realistic) basis (revival of the doctrine of monads?). [*J. F. Herbart,* born 1776, prof. at Göttingen, died 1841. Works, ed. by *Hartenstein,* Lpz. 1850–1852, 12 vols.] Among his disciples are *M. W. Drobisch,* prof. at Leipz., Religionsphil. 1840; *Gustav Hartenstein,* Metaphysik, 1836; Ethik, 1844; *G. F. Taute,* Religionsphil. 1840–1852; *E. A. Thilo,* Moderne

Rechtsphil. 1860. The school is represented by the Zeitschrift, ed. by *J. H. Fichte, Ulrici,* and *Wirth.*

(7) The principles of Schleiermacher were adopted, though with a stronger leaning towards orthodox theology, by *Nitzsch* (comp. § 282, note 7) and *A. D. Ch. Twesten,* Vorlesungen über die Dogmatik der evangelisch-lutherischen Kirche, Hamb. 1826, 3d ed. 1834, 2 vols. On the other hand, *Karl Hase* allowed to critical and speculative tendencies a greater influence; see his Lehrbuch der evangelischen Dogmatik, Stuttg. 1826, fourth improved edition, 1850; Gnosis, oder evangelische Glaubenslehre für die Gebildeten in der Gemeinde, Leipzig 1827, 2 vols. The most recent systems of theology are *J. T. Beck,* 1840; *Rothe,* Ethik, 1845, 1846 [and Dogmatik]; *Julius Müller* [Lehre von der Sünde, 2 Bde. 4th ed. 1838; transl. in Clark's Lib.]; *Liebner* (Christologie, Bd. i.), 1849; *J. P. Lange,* 1849–1852 [Christliche Dogmatik i., Phil. Dogmatik ii., Positive iii., Angewandte]; *Martensen,* 1850–1856 [from the Danish into German and English]; *J. H. A. Ebrard,* 1851, 1852 [Christliche Dogmatik]; *F. A. Philippi,* Kirchliche Glaubenslehre, Stuttg. 1854–1875, 5 vols., to be continued; *J. C. K. Hofmann,* Der Schriftbeweis, ein theologischer Versuch, Nördlingen 1852 ff., 2d ed. 1859, 3 vols.; *G. Thomasius,* Christi Person und Werk, 1853–1859, 3 vols.; *Daniel Schenkel,* Die christl. Dogmatik vom Standpunkte des Gewissens, 1859, 1860, 2 vols.; *Ch. H. Weisse,* Philosophische Dogmatik, 1855, 1860, 2 vols.; *Al. Schweizer,* Die christliche Glaubenslehre, u.s.w., 1863–1872, 3 vols., and others. Though representing different tendencies, yet these have as a common aim to give a philosophical basis to the biblical and orthodox system of faith, and thus to conquer rationalism by spiritual supremacy.

(8) So far as it is possible to group the representatives of these tendencies, we might say generally, that, in opposition to the critical, destructive tendency, which, however it may ignore it, has its first principles rooted in Pantheism, there is established a *positive, theistic* school, founded on the religious facts of consciousness and of history. The adherents of this latter school, however, differ so widely, that one class finds the positive in the orthodox Church doctrine, as it is given in the creeds and confessions (a tendency which comes out more in

the Lutheran than in the Reformed Church), while others regard only the Holy Scriptures as the highest rule of faith, and subordinate the symbols to the Bible. But here again (only under another form) the old antagonism appears between Rationalism and Supernaturalism, since one party, the strict Scripturists, simply identify the words of Scripture (in history and doctrine) with the word of God, and ignore the distinction, made on the ground of criticism and history, between what is God-given and what is human; whilst the others (although in different ways) seek to establish this distinction, without, however, wishing to reduce the contents of revelation to mere moral and religious maxims of human common sense, like the more trivial rationalism. The tendencies cross each other in particulars at many points; so that while the fermentation of opinions still goes on, they can afford no materials for the History of Doctrines.

That tendency which endeavoured to bring about a reconciliation between the two extremes was, at first, chiefly represented in the Theologische Zeitschrift (Berlin, 1819–1822), edited by *Schleiermacher*, *De Wette*, and *Lücke*, and afterwards in the *Studien und Kritiken*, edited by *Ullmann* and *Umbreit* (from the year 1828).—There have since been several other periodicals of this class, particularly the (Berlin) Zeitschrift f. christliche Wissenschaft und christ. Leben (founded by *Neander*, *Nitzsch*, *Müller*, *Tholuck*, and others), from 1850; the Jahrbücher f. deutsche Theologie, by *Liebner*, *Ehrenfeuchter*, *Dorner*, etc., Stuttg. 1856 ff.—The organ of the more advanced Hegelian party is the Theologische Jahrbücher, since 1842, by *Baur* and *Zeller* (now the Zeitschrift f. wissenschaftliche Theologie, ed. by *Hilgenfeld*).

§ 284.

The Latest Rationalistic Reaction.

After the destructive tendency, in its self-deception, had advanced even to the denial and dissolution of the religious self-consciousness (1), the modern *Rationalismus vulgaris* came forward with all its claims to become a religion for the people, fitted to the wants of the times, and denuded as far as possible of all dogmas; in short, to be for the people what, it said, religion had long been for a great part of educated minds. This was the aim of the so-called "Protestant Friends" (Friends

of Light—*Lichtfreunde*) (2), originating in Köthen, who obtained adherents in different countries, especially in the north of Germany, and were soon divided into several branch unions, and free churches (3). For the development of the History of Doctrines they have only a negative importance, and their place is rather in the transient story of the day than in the serious History of Doctrine. Of far greater moment is the struggle on fundamental principles, which has again sprung up between the conservative ecclesiastical party and the party of progress, as represented by *Stahl* and *Bunsen* (4); but of pre-eminent importance are the recent discussions of the Life and Person of Jesus Christ, and in connection with it, the historical basis of Christianity, which have called in question the foundations of Christian Doctrine, and the whole system of teaching resting upon them.

(1) *Ludwig Feuerbach*, Das Wesen des Christenthums, Lpz. 1841 ("in the service of a pneumatic water-cure!"); Das Wesen der Religion, 2te Aufl. 1850. [Essence of Christianity, transl. by *Marian Evans*, Lond. 1855. "Religion is a dream of the human mind;" "all theology is anthropology," etc.] "*Every unprejudiced person will allow that the philosophy of Feuerbach — a naked one-sided sensualism and materialism, where, however, the imagination, in which* (according to F.) *religion and Christianity repose, plays the strangest tricks—is, in truth, no philosophy at all.*" *Ulrici*, in *Herzog*, xii. s. 725.

(2) *Uhlich* and *Wislicenus*.—A meeting was held at Köthen, May 20, 1844.—Wislicenus' work, Ob Schrift, ob Geist? Lpz. 1845.—Thirteen Articles.—*Uhlich's* Reformation Theses.—See *Niedner*, Kg. s. 890, who gives the literature.—Another controversy was that of *Dulon* in Bremen; compare the Votum of the Heidelberg faculty, drawn up (by *Schenkel*) 1852.

(3) Societies in Breslau and Königsberg. *Rupp*, after his exclusion from the Free Church, was a preacher of the Free Evangelical Church at Königsberg. See *Niedner*, as above.

(4) *Bunsen*, Zeichen der Zeit, Leipz. 1855; Gott in der Geschichte, Leipz. 1857, 3 vols. These works gave rise to a controversy.—The "Protestantische Kirchenzeitung," edited by

H. Krause, may be considered as the organ of the freer Protestant tendency, introduced by Schleiermacher, and "Die Allgemeine Kirchliche Zeitschrift," by *Schenkel* (since 1859). [*Christian Charles Josias Bunsen*, born 1791, ambassador in England 1841–1853, died Nov. 28, 1860. Among his *works* are; Church of the Future, 1845, translated 1847; Egypt's Place in Universal Hist., 4 vols., English by *Cottrell*, 1848–1860: Ignatius, 1847; Hippolytus and his Age, 4 vols. and then 6 vols. 1854 ff.; Signs of the Times, transl.; Bible-Work, not completed, 9 vols. 1858–1870. *Friedrich Julius Stahl*, prof. at Erlangen, called to Berlin 1841. *Works:* Protestantische Kirchenverfassung; Rechtsphilosophie. Leading the party of the reaction, he has been involved in controversies on Protestantism and Catholicism, on the Union (advocating the claims of High Lutheranism), and against the Evangelical Alliance: Was ist die Revolution, 3te Aufl. 1852; Der Protestantismus als politisches Princip, 4te Aufl. 1853; Der Christl. Staat, 1858; Die Lutherische Kirche und die Union, 1859, 2te Aufl. 1860.]

§ 285.

The Protestant Church and Doctrine outside of Germany.

The doctrinal controversies related in the preceding sections (§§ 279–284) were almost entirely confined to Protestant Germany, but partially affected also Denmark and those parts of Reformed Switzerland in which the German language is spoken (1). Nearly all the other Protestant countries either took no notice of these conflicts, or formed erroneous and one-sided opinions concerning them (2). Lutheran orthodoxy maintained on the whole its ground in Sweden (3). In the Netherlands, the advocates of a more moderate (Arminian) tendency opposed the rigid orthodoxy of the Synod of Dort (4). In England there were some partial deviations from the 39 Articles (5), and some new sects sprung up (6). The theology called *Puseyism*, nurtured in the University of Oxford, tended

in both worship and dogma towards Catholicism; distinguishing, however, between the genuinely ecclesiastical and the Roman (7).—The Evangelical Alliance, started in London in 1846, is a grand attempt to do away with the ecclesiastical and dogmatic dissensions; but German theology can hardly be satisfied with its formal articles (8).—Nor did Protestant theology in France keep pace with the German culture (with the exception of Strassburg) (9); the laity were here the first to display a spirit of more profound inquiry into religious truth (10). The commotions in the Church of Geneva and the Canton de Vaud cannot be compared (either as to matter or form) with the contests between Rationalism and Supernaturalism in Germany (11). But the barriers which have hitherto prevented foreign Churches from appropriating the results of German learning seem gradually disappearing, and the same conflicts which have existed for a century in Germany are now represented in the different theological schools of Holland (12), in England and North America (13), and in Protestant France (14).

(1) In Denmark the controversy between Rationalism and Supernaturalism was carried on by *Clausen* and *Grundtvig* (see the Evangel. Kirchenzeit. 1827 ff. Studien und Kritiken, 1834, Heft 4; *Hase*, Kg. § 466). Among the German Reformed Churches of Switzerland in the last century, Zürich was especially affected by the theological tendencies then prevailing in Germany. (*Hess* and *Lavater* were the representatives of Supernaturalism, though each in a different way; *Häfeli*, *Stolz*, and *Schulthess*, of Rationalism.) The theology of Schleiermacher in the course of this century was here represented by *L. Usteri*, the author of the "Paulinischer Lehrbegriff," which in the later editions inclines to the views of *Hegel* and *Rosenkranz;* and *Alexander Schweizer* [an advocate of strict necessity as the inmost sense of the Reformed theology]. The call of *Strauss* to Zürich (1839) led to a violent controversy, and the call was revoked. In Schaffhausen, *Georg Müller* (died 1819; *he wrote:* Vom Glauben der Christen, Winterthür 1815, 2 vols.) endeavoured to propagate principles akin to those of Herder,

but in a more orthodox sense. In Bern, orthodoxy long maintained its ground in alliance with the aristocratic government. —Since the expulsion of the first representative of Rationalism (*Wetstein*, 1730) from Basel, its advocates have always been excluded from that town. For a long time it was (unjustly) considered as the seat of pietism.—By the renovation and foundation of the Swiss universities (Basel 1817–1835, Zürich 1833, Bern 1834), and the introduction of German professors (*De Wette* received a call from the University of Basel, 1821), the theology of Switzerland was brought into a closer and permanent connection with that of Germany. Since that time the various tendencies have found their various representatives, partly in native Swiss, partly in foreigners. The theology of "Progress," as it likes to call itself, has its representative in the "Zeitstimmen," which have appeared since 1859. A mediating tendency is represented by the "Kirchenblatt," which follows out the historical development of the Church.

(2) *H. J. Rose*, Der Zustand der protestantischen Religion in Deutschland, 4 Reden an der Univ. Cambridge, 1825, translated from the English, Leipz. 1826. [*Hugh James Rose*, born 1795, died 1838: State of Protestantism in Germany, 2d ed. 1829; comp. *E. B. Pusey's* Historical Inquiry, 2 vols. 1828–1830.]

(3) See *Guericke*, Kg. ii. s. 1084, 1087.

(4) See Die Unruhen in der niederländisch-reformirten Kirche während der Jahre, 1833–1839, von X. herausg. von *Gieseler*, Hamb. 1840. — Among the Dutch theologians, *Heringa*, *Clarisse*, *Royaards*, and others have followed the development of German theology. [*J. Clarisse*, Encyclop. Theol. 1835. *J. Ez. Heringa*, Opera Exeg., new ed. 1845; Het gebruiken misbruik der Kritik, 1793. *H. J. Royaards*, Chrest. Patrist. 1831, 1837. Comp. Hist. Eccles. 1840; Geschiedenis van het Christendom Nederland, 1853.]

(5) Thus the principles of Arianism propounded by *Samuel Clarke* (died 1729) at the commencement of the present period were adopted by some. *Howe* [Sherlock?] was accused of tritheism.—Among the English divines in North America, *Edwards* is the most distinguished. His chief works are on the Freedom of the Will, and on Original Sin.

(6) The rise of new sects both in England and the United

States of America is of no importance for the History of Doctrines. The greatest sensation was made by *Irving* (1792–1834), whose views gained some adherents even on the Continent. See *Hohl*, Bruchstücke aus dem Leben und den Schriften Ed. Irvings, St. Gallen 1839. [*Edward Irving*, born 1792, died 1834. *Works:* Oracles of God, 3d ed. 1834; Coming of Messiah, 2 vols. 1827; Babylon and Infidelity foredoomed, 1826. Collected ed. in 6 vols. London. See Life of Irving, by *Mrs. Oliphant*, var. edd. Death of Irving, by *Thos. Carlyle* in his "Essays."—Liturgy and Litany, Lond., var. edd.]

(7) The first traces of this tendency date from about 1820; the British Magazine, 1832; the Tracts for the Times, 1833 ff. The Catholic tendency advanced till 1841. Chief representatives: *Dr. Pusey* in Oxford (born 1800), *J. Keble, J. H. Newman*, who went over to the Roman Catholic Church. Comp. *Weaver*, Der Puseyismus in seinen Lehren und Tendenzen, from the English, by *Amthor*, Leipz. 1845. *Foch*, in Schwegler's Jahrbücher der Gegenwart, Aug. 1844. *Bruns* and *Häfners* Repertorium, May and July 1846. Allg. Berlin. Kirchenzeitung, 1846, Nr. 12, 32. (*Niedner*, Kircheng. s. 867.) Allg. Augsburg. Zeitung, 1847, Nr. 46, Beilage. [See next section.]

(8) See Der Evangel. Bund, von *K. Mann* and *Theod. Plitt*, Basel and Frankf. 1847. [Annual Reports of the Alliance, particularly that of the Berlin Meeting, 1857, by *Ed. Steane*.]

(9) *Blessig, Hafner, Redslob, Emmerich, Bruch, C. Reuss, Schmid, Kienlen.*

(10) *Benj. Constant, Cousin, Guizot.* Among the theologians we mention: *Vincent* of Nismes (Méditations et Discours, 1830 ss.), *Vinet* (died 1847), *Merle d'Aubigné, Gaussen, Sardinoux. Periodicals:* Ami de la Religion, Semeur; Lien (organ of a moderate liberalism); Espérance (moderate Church orthodoxy); Archives du Christianisme (organ of Dissenters); Avenir (organ of the Free Church). See *Ullmann*, Polemische Erörterungen, in Stud. und Kritiken, 1852. *H. Reuchlin*, Das Christenthum in Frankreich, Hamb. 1837.

(11) The formal aspect of the controversy respecting revelation was not at all mentioned. The opponents of the

so-called Momiers (*Chénevière* and others) may be said to hold Supranaturalistic principles, inasmuch as, proceeding from the doctrine of inspiration and the integrity of the canon, they found *their* dogmas upon Scripture (like the Socinians). That Arianism (!) could issue from this, shows the difference of French and German Rationalism. Comp. the works of *Chénevière, Bost, Malan.* Histoire véritable des Momiers, Par. 1824, Basle 1825. With this work compare: *De Wette,* Einige Bemerkungen über die kirchlichen Bewegungen in Genf (Basler wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift, iii. Heft 2, s. 33 ff.); and "Genfs Kirchliche und Christliche Zustände," by a theologian of French Switzerland, in the Zeitschrift für christl. Wissenschaft, 1850, Nr. 31–34. **Von der Goltz,* Die reformirte Kirche Genfs im 19 Jahrh., Basel u. Genf 1862.—The Darbyites and Irvingites have also made disciples in Switzerland. On the former, see *J. Herzog,* Les Frères de Plymouth et John Darby, Lausanne 1845; on the latter, see § 302, note 4.—A controversy on the inspiration of the Scripture was started by *Scherer,* in Geneva; a new French school on this basis has its organ in *Colani,* Revue de Théologie et de Philosophie, Strasb., since 1850.

(12) Thus the *Hague* school (*Groen van Prinsterer, Capadose,* and others) represents strict orthodoxy, the *Leyden* school (*Scholten*) Rationalism, the school of *Groningen* (*Hofstede de Groot*) a (liberal) mediation tendency. In the Church, opposed to moderate orthodoxy (*Chantepie de la Saussage, van Oosterzee, Trollet,* and others), is another which is at one with the Swiss "Zeitstimmen." Comp. *Réville,* Les controverses en Hollande, Revue des deux Mondes, 1860.

(13) The Oxford [?] *Essays and Reviews* and the critical investigations of *Colenso* on the Canon have evoked a conflict in the English Church, with at least the beneficial result of awaking this Church out of its theological slumber. In North America, Rationalism has found eloquent representatives in *William E. Channing* and *Theodore Parker* (died 1860) of Boston. Compare on the latter, *Lang* in the "Zeitstimmen," 1862, Nr. 17 ff. (1859, s. 379) [also *Weiss,* Life of Theod. Parker].

(14) A more liberal tendency was represented by *Alex. Vinet,* Essai sur les manifestations des convictions religieuses,

2d ed. 1859; Essais de Philosophie morale, 1837; Theol. Pastorale et Homiletique: Moralistes des xvie et xviie Siècles, 1859. Comp. *Astié's* Esprit de Vinet, 1860.—The Revue Chrétienne, published in Paris since 1853, edited by *Ed. de Pressensé*, represents substantially the school of Vinet. —Besides his work on Inspiration, *Scherer* has also written on the Church, and Mélanges de critique religieuse, 1861; he represents an extreme rationalistic tendency. *Ed. de Pressensé*, Histoire des trois premiers Siècles de l'Eglise, 2 tomes, 1858. The new school of theology (*Athanase Coquérel, Réville*) is opposed not only to the old and antiquated, but to the modern orthodoxy of *Guizot, Pressensé*, etc.

§ 285*a*.

[*Theology in England in the Eighteenth Century.*]

[Sir *James Stephen*, Essays in Ecclesiastical Biography, Lond. 1849, 2 vols. *Abbey and Overton*, The Eng. Church in the Eighteenth Century, Lond. 1878, 2 vols. *Stoughton*, Religion in England under Queen Anne and the Georges, Lond. 1878, 2 vols.]

[Apart from the Deistic movement, which has already been described, the religious history of England during the eighteenth century presents facts of obvious interest in reference to Christian dogma. The currents of doctrine were almost inseparably connected with the politics of the period. The High Church reaction, which had taken place under Charles II., was represented by the nonjurors (1), whilst the supporters of the Government were generally either Low Church or Latitudinarian (2). From various causes the state of religion sunk to a low ebb (3), until the Evangelical revival (4) restored to the Christian consciousness the doctrines of the Atonement, Justification, and Grace. In one division of the movement these took an Arminian form (5), in another a Calvinistic (6); the former being represented by the Wesleyans, and the latter by other Dissenters and by the Evangelical party within the Established Church. As a

reaction from the Evangelical movement came the Unitarian controversy, towards the end of the century (7).]

(1) [At the accession of William III., *Sancroft*, Archbp. of Canterbury, *Ken*, Bp. of Bath and Wells, and others, refused to take the oath of allegiance to the new king, and formed the nonjuring Communion, which represented the High Church doctrine. Among the most eminent of its leaders was the layman, *Robert Nelson*,—(born 1656, died 1715), who afterwards conformed: he *wrote* a work on the Fasts and Festivals of the Church; Comp. *Abbey*, l.c. chap. 3 (vol. i. p. 107 ff.),—Dean (nonjuring Bp.) *Hickes*, *John Johnson*, and others.]

(2) [Archbishop *Tillotson* (born 1630, Archbp. 1691, died 1694), although not chargeable with positive heterodoxy, from his comprehensiveness and perhaps his negative tone in regard to definite Christian doctrine, gave an impulse to the Latitudinarian movement, which was encouraged by the political circumstances of the age. (Comp. *Abbey*, l.c. chap. 5 and 6, vol. i. p. 263 ff.) This tendency spread until it was checked by the rise of the Evangelical movement.]

(3) [Various causes have been assigned for the decline of religion in the eighteenth century generally. Perhaps the rise of the scientific spirit may have exerted some influence. As regards the English Church, the following causes have been enumerated: (1) outward prosperity; (2) the deistic controversy; (3) effects of controversies in sixteenth and seventeenth centuries; (4) political power of the Church; (5) want of synodal action; (6) spirit of the age. Compare *Overton*, l.c. vol. ii. chap. 1, p. 3 ff.]

(4) [The leader in this revival, *John Wesley*, has been already mentioned. It was to *William Law* (born 1686, died 1761), the nonjuror, that he was indebted for the first impulses to a religious life. "William Law begot Methodism" (*Bp. Warburton*). W. Law was a High Church Mystic, who had come under the influence of J. Böhm and others. Wesley retained to the end much of the spirit which he had learnt of Law, but was violently opposed afterwards to his mysticism and his vagueness in regard to justification. On the influence of Law and his two great works, The Serious

Call, and Christian Perfection, see *Abbey*, l.c. vol. i. p. 575 ff., and *Overton*, vol. ii. p. 61 ff. The state of religion has been exaggerated; but the sermons of the middle of the eighteenth century have little distinctive Christian doctrine (comp. *Stephen*, Essays, u. s.), and Bishop *Butler* mentions that the claims of Christianity were almost ignored.]

(5) [*Wesley* and his followers were Arminian, and strongly opposed to the Calvinistic doctrines of particular redemption, irresistible grace, and indefectible grace. This Arminian tendency has been continued in the Wesleyan Methodists, whose Confession of Faith is the teaching of the Church of England, supplemented by Wesley's Sermons.]

(6) [*Whitefield* was the representative of the Calvinistic school in the revival; and this was generally the favourite form of Evangelicalism in the Established Church, and almost universally among Independents and Baptists. *Toplady*, an English clergyman (born 1740, died 1778), who wrote the hymn "Rock of Ages," maintained a strong and sometimes violent polemic against Wesley and the Arminians in his "Gospel Magazine."]

(7) [The principal advocate of Unitarian views was *Joseph Priestley* (born 1733, died 1804), more eminent in science than in theology. His most important controversy was with Bishop *Horsley* (1783–1786). On the Unitarian side was also *Thomas Belsham* (born 1730, died 1809); on the other side, Bp. *Burgess*, Dr. *J. Pye Smith* (Independent), Archbp. *W. Magee* (born 1763, died 1831). *He wrote:* Dissertation on Atonement and Sacrifice, Dublin 1801, and var. edd. The influence of Unitarianism was seen in the fact that many Presbyterian congregations in England became Unitarian.]

§ 285*b*.

[*English Theology and Philosophy in the present Century.*]

[The Evangelical revival continued to influence the theology of the English Church in the nineteenth century; but the deeper study of philosophy, under the influence of *Coleridge* (1), led to dissatisfaction with the current philo-

sophical and theological theories. The influence of *Edward Irving* (2) was also felt in the Established Church; and the renewed study of the Fathers and early Church writers led to the Oxford movement (3). This was stimulated by the apparent prospect of disestablishment. The Oxford or Tractarian school led to what is known as the Ritualistic (4) movement, in which both doctrines were taught and modes of worship introduced which became the subject of actions in the ecclesiastical courts. At the same time a new form of the Latitudinarian (5) movement appeared, partly as a reaction from the Oxford Divinity, partly as a result of the teaching of Coleridge and his disciples, which gave rise to controversies and to an appeal to the ecclesiastical courts.]

(1) [*Samuel Taylor Coleridge* (born 1772, died 1834) came under the influence of the German philosophy, especially that of Schelling, and was the means of promoting the study of German literature in England. *He wrote:* The Friend, 1812, 3 vols.; Biographia Literaria, 1817, 2 vols.; Aids to Reflection, 1825. He influenced Arnold, Maurice, Kingsley, and others. The most pure Coleridgian, perhaps, was *F. D. Maurice* (born 1805, died 1869), chaplain of Lincoln's Inn, prof. of Eccl. History at King's Coll., London (a post which he was required to resign in consequence of his views on everlasting punishment), afterwards prof. of Moral Philosophy at Cambridge. *Wrote:* Kingdom of Christ, 1838, 3 vols.; re-written, 1842, 2 vols.; Theol. Essays, 1853. Opposed by *Mansel* in Bampton Lectures, 1858 (var. edd.). Replied, 1859, etc.]

(2) [*Edward Irving* (see above) acknowledged his great obligation to Coleridge. Comp. his Preface to his Missionary Sermon, in Works (u. s.).]

(3) [*Tracts for the Times*, by Members of the University of Oxford, 6 vols. 1833–1840, 90 in number. They declared that the Church of England was not Protestant, and advocated (1) Apostolical Succession; (2) Sacramental Grace (baptismal regeneration and the eucharistic sacrifice); (3) Church's independence of State; (4) Episcopal and Church authority; tradition with the Scriptures; (5) Revival of certain ecclesi-

astical usages, *e.g.* altars of stone, lights, private confession, etc. No. 90, by *J. H. Newman*, advocated subscription to the Articles in a non-natural sense; condemned by the Hebdomadal Board. Comp. *F. Oakley*, Tract No. 90 examined, 1841; *J. H. Newman*, Letter to Bp. of Oxf. on No. 90; *E. B. Pusey*, Articles and Tract 90 reconsidered, in a Letter to *R. W. Jelf*. *E. B. Pusey*, Regius Prof. of Hebrew, Oxf.: Letter to Bp. of Oxf. on Tendency to Romanism, 4th ed., with Preface on Justification, 1840; To Abp. of Canterbury, on Present Crisis, 3d ed. 1842; Royal Supremacy, 1850; The Church of Eng. leaves her Children Free to open their Griefs, 1850, with a Vindication; The Real Presence (u. s.). *John Henry Newman:* Arians of Fourth Cent. 1833; Parochial Sermons, 6 vols. 1835; Prophetical Office of Church; Justification; Ch. of Fathers; Sermons, 1843; Essays on Miracles, 1843; Essay on Development of Christ. Doctrine, 1845; Apologia pro Vita, var. edd. Uniform ed. of works completed in 1879. Mr. Newman submitted to the Roman Catholic Church in 1845. Made a Cardinal in 1879. *Richd. H. Froude*, born 1803, died 1836: Remains, 4 vols. 1838 (he gave an impulse to this whole movement). *John Keble:* Primitive Tradition, 1839; Christian Year, and Lyra Innocentium; Psalter in English verse; Sermons, 1847; Prælect. Academ., 2 vols., Oxf. 1844; ed. Hooker's Eccl. Polity. *Henry Wm.* and *Robert Isaac Wilberforce*, became Roman Catholics; the latter wrote: Doctrine of Baptism; Incarnation; Eucharist; Sermons on New Birth. *Wm. G. Ward* (R. C.): Ideal of Christ. Church, 1844; Nature and Grace, 1860. *Fred. Oakley* (R. C.): On Submitting to Catholic Church, Sermons, etc. *F. W. Faber* (R. C.): Tracts on Church and Prayer Book. *Henry Ed. Manning*, Archd. Chichester (became R. C.): Unity of Church, 1842; Sermons, 5 vols.; Holy Baptism, 1844; Grounds of Faith, 1852; afterwards Archb. of Westminster, and Cardinal.]

(4) [The Ritualistic movement is of too recent origin to be here described. Its most powerful organization is the English Church Union, formed to resist actions in the ecclesiastical courts against clergymen of that party. (See the Special History of Doctrines below.)]

(5) [Bp. *R. D. Hampden* was one of the first to lead a

Latitudinarian reaction in Oxford. His appointment to the see of Hereford (1847) was violently opposed by High Churchmen and Low Churchmen, especially the former. (See *Ashwell*, Life of Bp. S. Wilberforce, vol. i.) *R. Whately* (Archb. of Dublin) represented a liberal tendency in the Church, but rather on the ground of the older English philosophy. Comp. his Essays; Peculiarities of Christian Revelation; Writings of St. Paul. *H. H. Milman*, Dean of St. Paul's, also belonged to the same school. Bampton Lectures, 1827; History of Jews, 1840, 3 vols. and var. edd.; History of Christianity, 1840, 3 vols.; History of Latin Christianity, 6 vols. var. edd. Among those who were influenced by Coleridge (and Bunsen) were Dr. *T. Arnold* (born 1798, died 1842), Head Master of Rugby School. *Wrote:* Hist. of Rome; Sermons, etc. Opposed the Oxford school in Introduction to his Sermons on the Christian Life. *F. W. Robertson:* (Posthumous) Sermons, 4 vols. Dean *A. P. Stanley:* Essays on Apostolic Age, 1847; Lectures on Eastern Church; Lectures on Jewish Church, 3 vols., etc. A more extreme tendency is represented by Professor *Jowett* (afterwards Master of Balliol College, Oxford) in Essays and Reviews, *R. Williams* (ib.), and others. These Essays were condemned by Convocation, and became the subject of a trial (which failed) in the ecclesiastical courts.]

§ 285a.

[*Theology and Philosophy in Scotland.*[1]]

[In Scotland the scepticism of *David Hume* (1) was supplanted by the vigorous common sense of *Thomas Reid* (2). On the same general basis *Dugald Stewart* wrote his eloquent Disquisitions. Dr. *Thos. Brown*, in his fervid Lectures, criticized details of the system with great ingenuity, without effecting permanent results. Sir *William Hamilton*, with unusual learning and subtlety, commented on Reid, defined clearly the province of Logic, and tried to overthrow tran-

[1] [Adapted from Dr. H. B. Smith.]

scendental speculations by a denial of all positive knowledge of the Infinite and the Absolute (3). Other Scotch philosophers (4) have rendered good service in different branches of speculation.]

[The revival of evangelical theology was stimulated by the preaching and teaching of *Thos. Chalmers* (5). The Free Church, 1843 (the most remarkable religious movement of the century), almost doubled the number of Presbyterian churches in Scotland (6). The recent representatives of Scotch theology and of Biblical learning unite adherence to the older confessions with a liberal and earnest scholarship (7).]

(1) [*David Hume* (see §§ 275, 285). His Essay on Miracles provoked the most immediate opposition; but the fundamental principles of his sceptical philosophy, asserting that nothing is certain (real) but sensations and ideas, aroused a profounder criticism; awaking Kant in Germany "from his dogmatic slumbers," and leading Reid to plant philosophy upon "common sense," afterwards defined as the "fundamental laws of human belief." See *Cousin*, Hist. of Mod. Philos.; *Hamilton's* Discussions.]

(2) [*Thos. Reid* (born 1709, died 1796), prof. Moral Philosophy in Glasgow, 1764: Inquiry into the Human Mind on Principles of Common Sense, 1764; Essay on the Intellectual Powers of the Human Mind, 1764, 3 vols. 1819; Active Powers, 1788; *Hamilton's* ed., Edinb. 1846 ff. His works have been translated into French; Royer-Collard adopted his views; see *Cousin's* Lectures. Metaphysics, as distinct from Psychology, was ignored in Scotland from the time of Reid.]

(3) [Sir *William Hamilton*, born in Glasgow 1788, prof. Logic and Metaph. in Edinb. 1836, died 1856. Discussions in Phil. Lit., etc., reprinted from reviews; Lectures on Metaphysics and Logic, ed. by *Mansel* and *Veitch*, 4 vols. While verbally defending, he in reality undermined the fundamental principles of the Scotch system, making the infinite and absolute merely negative ideas, although admitting the necessity of belief. Comp. *Baynes*, in Edinb. Essays, 1854. On his system, see *Calderwood's* Philosophy of Infinite, 2d ed. 1861.

Hamilton's most illustrious successor was Professor *Mansel* of Oxford (Bampton Lecturer, 1858), afterwards Dean of St. Paul's. Died 1871.]

(4) [*J. F. Ferrier,* Institutes of Metaphysics. *Jas. McCosh,* Method of Divine Government, Physical and Moral; Intuitions of the Mind. *A. C. Fraser,* Rational Philosophy, 1858; and ed. of Berkeley's Works in 4 vols.]

(5) [*Thos. Chalmers,* born 1780, Glasgow 1814, prof. St. Andrews 1824, Edinb. 1828, prof. Theol. Free Church College 1843, died 1847: Memoirs, by Dr. *W. Hanna,* 4 vols.—Among his works are Natural Theology; Internal Evidences; Sketches of Moral and Mental Phil.; Discourses on Astronomy, 1817; Christian and Economic Polity, 1821–1826; Bridgewater Treatise; Institutes of Theology, 2 vols.; Prælections on Butler, Paley, and Hill. He adopted in the main the theology of Edwards.]

(6) [The Free Church movement was on the question of State patronage and intrusion, raised by the Auchterarder Case, 1837. The Assembly, 241 to 110, in 1842, passed the *Protest anent Encroachments.* The House of Lords decided against it. In 1843, Solemn Protest against State Encroachments, and withdrawal of 474. Dr. *Welsh,* moderator; Chalmers, Gordon, M'Farlane, and others. Five hundred new churches were built in a year. Comp. *Candlish,* Summary of the Quest. respecting the Church of Scotland, 1841.]

(7) [*John Brown* (United Presb.), died 1857: Civil Obedience, 3d ed. 1839; Discourses and Sayings of Christ, 3 vols., etc. *John Eadie* (United Presb.): Ephesians, 1853; Colossians, 1856; Philippians, 1859.—*Patrick Fairbairn* (Free Ch.), Typology of Script., 2 vols.; Prophecy; Hermeneutical Manual, 1858. *Ralph Wardlaw* (Ind.), died 1853: Socinian Controversy, 1815, 1816; Christian Ethics; Atonement, 3d ed. 1845; Infant Baptism, 1846. *W. L. Alexander* (Ind.), Anglo-Catholicism not Apostolical, 1843; Christ and Christianity. Among more recent writers are Dr. *A. M. Fairbairn* (?), Dr. *A. B. Bruce* (Free Ch.), and others.]

§ 285*d*.

[*Theology in the United States of America.*[1]]

New England: Edwards and his School.

[Christian Theology in America has received some peculiar modifications adapting it to the new position and relations of the Church. Its most marked and original growth has been in the line of the Reformed or Calvinistic system. The separation of the Church from the State, the unexampled immigration, and the rapid growth of the country, made the pressure to come upon the practical rather than the theoretical aspects of Christian truth. Hence the most thorough discussions and controversies have been chiefly upon questions of anthropology and soteriology. Systems of theology have all been preached. Controversy, too, has been sharpened by the fact, that in the new world are representatives of all the ecclesiastical divisions of the old world, with many sectarian subdivisions. The minor sects of Europe have had the sway in America.]

[The starting-point in this new development of the Reformed faith is with *Jonathan Edwards* (1), who fortified the Calvinistic theology against Arminian objections, in his works on the Will and on Original Sin. The central idea of his system is that of spiritual life (holy love) as the gift of divine grace. Extensive revivals of religion attended his preaching (*Whitefield*). *Samuel Hopkins* (2) gave to Edwards' theory of virtue (love to being) the form of disinterested benevolence; held that sin (overruled) was an advantage to the universe; and equally enforced the divine sovereignty and the obligation of immediate repentance (*Hopkinsianism*). The younger *Edwards* (3) modified the theory of the Atonement. *The New Haven theology* (4) planted itself in direct opposition to

[1] [Dr. H. B. Smith.]

the old Hopkinsian theories on three points, viz. divine efficiency, sin as the necessary means of the greatest good, and the nature of virtue, while agreeing with *Emmons* in the position, that all that is moral is in exercises (interpreted as acts of the will). *Unitarianism* (5) was an offshoot from the lingering Arminianism of New England, and also in part a reaction from extreme Calvinistic principles, and a further, onesided, development of some of the ethical principles of the prevalent theology (*William Ellery Channing, Norton, Dewey,* and others). The speculations of *Horace Bushnell* (6) revived the controversy as to the person of Christ.]

(1) [*Jonathan Edwards,* born 1703, at Northampton 1727, dismissed 1750, missionary at Stockbridge, died 1758, Pres. of N. J. College. Religious Affections, 1746; Freedom of the Will, 1754—philosophical necessity; Original Sin, 1758—identity with Adam in his transgression ("the guilt a man has upon his soul at his first existence is one and simple, viz. the guilt of the original apostasy, the guilt of the sin by which the species first rebelled against God"). His chief posthumous works (by *Hopkins*) were Hist. of Redemption, 1774; Nature of Virtue, 1788; the End of God in Creation (His declarative glory). *Works:* Worcester, Mass. 8 vols. 1809; Lond. ed. *Williams,* 8 vols. 1817; vols. 9, 10, Edinb. 1847; Lond. 2 vols. by *Hickman,* 1839.—"I consider Jonathan Edwards the greatest of the sons of men."—*Robert Hall.* "He in fact commenced a new and higher school in divinity, to which many subsequent writers, Erskine, Fuller, Newton, Scott, Ryland, the Milners, Dwight, and, indeed, the great body of evangelical authors, who have since lived, have been indebted."—*E. Bickersteth.* "His power of subtle argument, perhaps unmatched, certainly unsurpassed among men, was joined, as in some of the ancient mystics, with a character which raised his piety to fervour."—Sir *James Mackintosh.*—On his work on the Will, see *Dugald Stewart; Isaac Taylor,* Introductory Essay.]

(2) [*Samuel Hopkins,* born 1721, Great Barrington 1740–1760, died 1803: System of Theology, 2 vols. 1793, 1811. Works, 3 vols. Bost. 1853; Memoir by *E. A. Park,* 2d ed. 1854; Sin through the Divine Interposition an Advantage to the

Universe, 1759; Promises of Gospel not made to the exercises of the Unregenerate (against *Mayhew*), 1765; Div. of Christ, 1768; True State of Unregenerate (against *Mills*), 1769; True Holiness (against *Hemmenway*), 1773–1791.—The points in which the old Hopkinsianism was distinguished from the older Calvinism were: 1. Divine efficiency extending to all acts (more sharply stated by *Emmons*); 2. Sin, the necessary means of the greatest good; 3. The atonement unlimited, as a provision; 4. Obligation to immediate repentance; 5. Sharper distinction between natural and moral ability and inability; 6. Disinterested benevolence (involving unconditional submission, in the form of a willingness to be cast away for ever, for the divine glory); 7. The theory of the covenants resolved into a divine constitution (imputation, as a transfer of moral character, discredited); 8. Prior to moral exercises, there is only a divine constitution, and no moral character (hinted at by Hopkins, and developed by Emmons). But in the exercises, the will was not yet distinguished from the affections.]

(3) [*Jonathan Edwards* the younger, born 1745, died 1801, Pres. Union College, N. Y.: Salvation of All Men examined (reply to *Chauncey*); Liberty and Necessity; Three Sermons on the Atonement, 1785, etc. Works, with Memoir by *Tryon Edwards*, 2 vols. Andov. 1842. He represents the atonement as a satisfaction to the general or public, not to the distributive, justice of God. See The Atonement; Discourses and Treatises by Edwards, Smalley, Maxcy, Emmons, Griffin, Burge, and Weeks. With an Introd. Essay by *E. A. Park*, Boston 1859, who attempts to find hints of the same view in the earlier New. Eng. divines.]

(4) [*Nathaniel W. Taylor*, prof. Theol. New Haven, born 1786, died 1858: Sermons, Lects. on Moral Government; Essays in Revealed Theology, 1858–1859.—Dr. Taylor opposed Hopkinsianism on the points above stated, and advocated the positions—that self-love is the spring of all moral action; that the sinner has natural ability (as power to the contrary) to repent; that the reason of the divine permission of sin may be, that God could not (from the nature of free agency) prevent all sin in a moral system. The atonement was vindicated as a governmental scheme.]

(5) [*William Ellery Channing*, born 1780, died 1842.

Works, 5 vols. 1841; 6 vols. 1846; repr. Lond., and several transl. into French and German. From Hopkins he received the principle of disinterested benevolence, without its Hopkinsian inferences. Memoir by *W. H. Channing*, 3 vols. 1843. *Andrews Norton*, born 1786, died 1853, prof. at Cambridge (see above): Genuineness of Gospels, 1837–1844. *Orville Dewey*: Discourses, Controv. Theol. etc., 3 vols. 1846–1877.—*Theodore Parker* represents the most extreme section of Unitarianism, and approaches Pantheism. Comp. his Discourse of matters pertaining to Religion (var. edd.), and his life by *Weiss*, 2 vols.]

(6) [*Horace Bushnell*, Hartfort, Ct.: on Christ. Nurture; God in Christ, 1849; Nature and the Supernatural, 1858.—Dr. B.'s position is, that the Trinity is in and for the sphere of a revelation, though there may be an eternal ground for it in the Godhead.]

§ 286.

Conflicts of the Confessions.

It was characteristic of the theology of the eighteenth century, that it attached less importance to the denominational differences of the confessions of faith, upon which so much stress had been laid in the preceding period. These differences had receded in view of the new and fresh antagonisms. The cause of this was not only rationalistic indifferentism, but also the efforts of the Pietists, and other sects of a similar character, for the promotion of practical piety (1). Although the union of Catholicism with Protestantism was restricted to pious and impracticable wishes (2), yet, on the other hand, in several parts of Germany a union was brought about between the Lutherans and the Reformed (3). But even this union led to a revival of the former denominational differences, which were not only made the subject of scientific discussion (4), but also gave rise to separations and commotions in the Church (5). Thus Scriptural Supernaturalism, as well as old Lutheran orthodoxy (6), and the rigid Calvinism (7) of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, were strongly defended

in the nineteenth. The work of union has been very much shaken by this dogmatic partisan hatred.

(1) Comp. *Urlsperger* (§ 277, note 6), *Zinzendorf* (§ 278).

(2) Did *Lavater* and *Sailer* labour to effect such a union? — Connection of the literary romantic school with the catholicizing tendency in the Protestant Church.—Conversions and proselytism. See the works on Church history.

(3) 1817–1830: Prussia, Nassau, Baden, the electorate of Hessen, Hessen-Darmstadt, Würtemberg. Compare the works on Church history.

(4) Among the writers on systematic theology, *Augusti*, long before the establishment of the Union, showed the scientific necessity of enabling the students of theology to obtain a more thorough knowledge of the systematic theology of the Lutheran Church, which even Lessing held to be more than "a patchwork of blunderers and semi-philosophers," in his work: System der Christlichen Dogmatik, nach dem Lehrbegriff der lutherischen Kirche, im Grundrisse dargestellt, Leipz. 1809.—Respecting particular doctrines, see the Special History of Doctrines (Lord's Supper, Predestination, etc.). The revived study of symbolism (see § 282) also helped in this matter.

(5) *Steffens*, Wie ich wieder ein Lutheraner wurde und was mir das Lutherthum ist, Breslau 1831; *Scheibel*, Geschichte der luther. Gemeinde in Breslau, Nürn. 1832, etc.; *Guericke* (1835), *Kellner*, *Wehrhahn*, and others. On the commotions, suspensions, banishments, etc., to which these conflicts gave rise, see the works on ecclesiastical history, also *H. Olshausen*, Was ist von den neuesten kirchlichen Ereignissen in Schlesien zu halten? Leipz. 1835. Cf. *Niedner*, Kg. s. 888 ff. *Nitzsch*, Urkundenbuch der evang. Union, Bonn 1853. *Schenkel*, Der unionsberuf des evangelischen Protestantismus, Heidelb. 1855, and the arts. "Union" and "Unionsversuche" in *Herzog's* Realenc. xvi. s. 658 ff.

(6) *Rudelbach* und *Guericke*, Zeitschrift für die gesammte lutherische Theologie und Kirche, from the year 1840. *Rudelbach*, Reformation, Lutherthum und Union, Leipz. 1839. Somewhat later we find the camp of the Ultra-Lutherans itself divided into fractions; see *Gieseler*, Kirchengeschichte

der neuesten Zeit (Bonn 1855), s. 213, 277. The Lutherans represented by the Zeitschrift für Protestantismus und Kirche, edited by *Thomasius, Hofmann,* and *Scheurl.* [The chief works in this controversy are, *Julius Müller,* Die evang. Union, 1854, and *F. J. Stahl* (died 1861), Die lutherische Kirche und die Union, 2te Aufl. 1860. *Baur,* Dogmengeschichte, s. 356, represents the course of things thus: The Church in opposition to the new philosophic speculations could not take any other consistent standpoint than that of the older Confessions; but as soon as they come back to them earnestly, the old conflicts of the symbols must break out anew.]

(7) Among the so-called Momiers in the Church of Geneva (comp. § 285, note 9), in the Netherlands, and in the district of Elberfeld; yet it cannot be pretended that there was a revival of older Calvinism, like that of old Lutheranism (*Niedner,* s. 885).

§ 287.

The Roman Catholic Church. German Catholicism.

The development of the Roman Catholic Church in *Germany* was different from that in *France;* for these two countries alone here come into consideration (1). In the former country, Romanism was affected by the influence of the philosophical systems, and the prevailing intellectual tendency of the age. While some Roman Catholics, especially as favoured during the reign of Joseph II. of Austria, directed their efforts chiefly to the reform of the government of the Church (2), there were others who sought partly to rationalize (*auf*klären) (3), and partly to idealize (*ver*klären) the Roman Catholic doctrine (4). Here modern speculation led through the indefinite views of the older rationalism, to a more profound and philosophical advocacy of their doctrines in their conscious distinction from those of the Protestant Church. This was the case especially with *Hermes* (5), *Möhler* (6), and *Günther* (7), though with different degrees of success. In France, the Jansenistic controversy was continued at the

beginning of the present period in the controversy respecting the Constitution (8). From the time of the French Revolution, theological conflicts appear so intimately interwoven with political contests, as to preclude the expectation that even those highly talented men who took a prominent part in these conflicts (9) would do much for the scientific development of theology. The theological system of *Bautain* is of special importance in its relation to the theology of Hermes. The former tried to prove on speculative ground that speculation is not admissible in systematic theology, and rested his system entirely upon faith (10); while Hermes endeavoured to establish faith by means of philosophy. Both systems were condemned by the Papal See as being founded on extreme views.—The so-called *German Catholicism* troubled itself less about dogmatic principles. Called into being by an extreme Roman Catholic superstition (11), it planted itself upon a rationalistic eclecticism (12); and though a fraction sought to save more positive elements, yet it was devoid of thorough theological basis (13). [The Roman Catholic literature of England (14) and the United States of America (15) has been chiefly historical and controversial.]

(1) Among the Italian theologians, the most eminent is the Jesuit *Perrone*, prof. in the Collegium Romanum: Prælectiones Theologicæ, Rom. 1835; in German, Landshut 1852. [Some thirty or forty editions of this work and its abridgment have been published; Perrone has also written on the Rule of Faith (Latin and French), 3 vols. 1853; on the Immaculate Conception, 1848; on the Godhead of Christ, etc. Perrone was born 1794, and became prof. in Rome 1823.]

(2) Joseph II. (reigned from the year 1780) stood in the same relation to the Roman Catholic Church in which Frederick II. stood to the Protestant Church, but manifested greater interest for religion, and was also more positively dictatorial. Concerning *Justinus Febronius* (Nicolas von Hontheim) and the Punctation of Ems (1786), and *Scipio Ricci*, Bishop of Pistoia and Prato under Leopold of Tuscany, see the works on Church history. The contests respecting

the hierarchy, celibacy, and monasticism also belong to Church history, and not to the History of Doctrines.

(3) *Isenbiehl* (1774) was violently attacked on account of his interpretation of the Messianic prophecies. — In later times the critical and exegetical labours of *Jahn*, *Hug*, and *Scholz* were distinguished by a more liberal spirit of inquiry. —*Dereser* and the brothers *Van Ess* translated the sacred Scriptures into German. *Blau* (died 1798) undermined the doctrine of the infallibility of the Church (Frankf. 1791).— *Joseph Muth* examined the relation in which Christianity stands to the religion of reason (Hadamar 1818). *Anton Michl* manifested more liberal views in the treatment of ecclesiastical history. [See *Kuhn*, Kathol. Dogmatik, Bd. i. 2te Aufl. s. 515. Kuhn's own work takes a high rank among the modern Roman Catholic systems, in the attempt to reconcile faith and reason; the second volume is on the Trinity.]

(4) *Wessenberg* and his school were characterized by an idealizing tendency, and a spirit of toleration towards other communions. [*Von Wessenberg-Ampringen*, born 1777, died 1860; from 1817 to 1827, in the diocese of Constance, in conflict with Rome.] Comp. (*Keller*) Katholikon, für Alle unter jeder Form das Eine, Aarau 1827. On the other hand, *Sailer* (1751–1832), in distinction from this more rationalizing tendency, endeavoured to represent Romanism in an attractive form, by the use of mystic phraseology; and lastly, some others, such as *Martin Boos*, *Al. Henhöfer*, and *Johann Gossner*, sought to introduce the stricter evangelical principle (and Pietism) into the theology of the Roman Catholic Church; the two latter afterwards became converts to the Protestant faith, but not the first; see his autobiography, edited by *Gossner*, Leipz. 1826.—In opposition to these reforming tendencies, *Görres* (born 1776) endeavoured to maintain the principles of the Catholicism of the Middle Ages. His works, characterized by vigour and genius, gave new support to the school of Munich. [*Joseph Görres*, born 1776, died 1848.]

(5) *Georg Hermes*, born 1775, was professor of theology in Münster and Bonn, and died 1831. By asserting that the Roman doctrine might be proved philosophically, he endangered

the authority of the Church, for which his philosophy provided no sufficient guarantees. See his Einleitung in die christ-katholische Theologie, Münster 1819, 1831, 2d vol. 1829. Christ-katholische Dogmatik, herausgegeben von *Achterfeldt*, Münster 1834, 3 vols. His theory was condemned by Pope Gregory XVI. (1835). Comp. *P. J. Elvenich*, Acta Hermesiana, Gött. 1836. *Zell*, Acta antihermesiana, Sittard 1836. *Braun* et *Elvenich*, Meletemata theologica, Lips. 1838; Acta Romana, Han. 1838. *Rheinwald*, Repertor. xxxii.–xxxiv. The condemnation of Hermes was renewed by Pope Pius IX. in 1847.

(6) *Möhler* was born 1796, and died 1838. Having received his first impressions from the study of Protestant theology (*Schleiermacher*), he afterwards employed his knowledge to oppose it. By his Symbolik (Mainz 1832) he revived the controversy between the Roman Catholics and Protestants, and induced the latter to re-examine their own principles. [Symbolism, transl. by J. R. Robertson, 2 vols., Lond. 1843; answered by *Baur*, etc., see above. *P. Marheinecke*, Ueber M.'s Symbolik, Berl. 1833.]—The most eminent theologians and philosophers of the Roman Catholic Church are: *Franz Baader* (died in Munich, 1841; works edited by *A. Lutterbeck*, 16 Bde. 1852–1860); *F. A. Staudenmaier*, died 1854 (among his numerous *works* we mention: Encyclopädie, 1834. Philosophie des Christenthums, 1839. Metaphysik der heiligen Schrift, 1840); *J. B. Hirscher* (he *wrote:* Ueber das Verhältniss des Evangeliums zu der theologischen Scholastik der neuesten Zeit im katholischen Deutschland, Tüb. 1823. Die Katholische Lehre vom Ablasse, ibid. 1829).

(7) *Günther*, Vorschule zur specul. Theol., Wien 1828, 1848, 2 vols. Comp. *N. P. Oischinger*, Die Günthersche Philos., Schaffh. 1852. *Baltzer*, Neue theol. Briefe an Günther, Bresl. 1853. Comp. Die specul. Theologie Günthers und seiner Schule (reprinted from Himmelsteins Kathol. Wochenschrift), Würzb. 1853. Rud. and Guericke's Zeitschrift f. lutherische Theol. xvi. 1855, 2. *Hase*, Kg. (7 Aufl.) s. 691. [Günther was condemned at Rome, 1857, for his teachings on the Trinity, Incarnation, and Creation; and submitted.]

(8) The relation in which *Zinzendorf* stood to Jansenism is worthy of notice: "*Jansenism was the salt without which the*

Roman Catholic Church of that period (the beginning of the eighteenth century) *would have perished.*"—*Tholuck*, Schriften, ii. s. 33. On the various modifications of Jansenism, see *Hase*, Kg. § 437.

(9) The anti-ecclesiastical theories of Theophilanthropinism (1796–1802) and, at a later period, of St. Simonism, had only a temporary existence. Romanism was brought into connection with politics by *Chateaubriand* (born 1769) and *Lamennais*.—The rationalistic Church of Abbé *Chatel* (August 1830). [*Chateaubriand*, born 1769, died 1848; his Génie du Christianisme was published in 1802, English version by *F. Shoberl*, 2 vols. 1811. *Bautain* has also published a Moral Philosophy, 1842, and Psychology. *De la Mennais*, died 1854. His work, Sur l'Indifférence en Matière de Religion (1817–1823, 9th ed. 1851), was an eloquent advocacy of Rome; but he abandoned the traditional faith in Affaires de Rome, and Esquisse d'une Philosophie, 1841–1845. Count *Joseph de Maistre* (died 1821) defended the ultramontane idea of the Papacy, and inveighed against the Baconian induction. —*Aug. Nicolas*, Etudes philosophiques, sur le Christianisme, 4 vols. 7th ed. 1854.]

(10) *Bautain*, Philosophie du Christianisme, Strasb. 1835. *Rheinwald*, Acta histor. eccles. 1835, p. 305 ss., 1837, p. 68 ss. *F. Jünge*, in Illgens Zeitschrift für historische Theologie, 1837, vii. Heft 2. His system was condemned by the Pope, Dec. 20, 1834. Comp. †*Kuhn*, Ueber Glauben und Wissen, in the theologisch. Quartalschrift, 1839, 3.

(11) History of the Holy Coat of Trier (Trèves). See *Niedner*, s. 926.

(12) *Johann Ronge* (born 1813) of Laurahütte, in Silesia, Letter to Arnoldi, Bp. of Trèves, Oct. 1844.—Council at Leipzig, March 23–26, 1845. His system given by *Niedner*, s. 927, note. [He denounced papacy and hierarchy, and claimed full freedom of conscience and of investigation; the statements of his faith are simply those of the Apostles' Creed.]

(13) *Johann Czerski* of Schneidemühl (in Prussian Posen), Offenes Glaubensbekenntniss der Christl.-Apostol.-Kathol. Gemeinde zu Schneidemühl in ihren Unterscheidungslehren von der Röm.-Kath. Kirche, Stuttg. 1844.—*Czerski*, Sendschreiben au alle christl.-theol.-kathol., Gemeinden, June 1845.

—Berlin Protestant Church, May to August 1845.—Meeting of Ronge, Theiner, and Czerski, in Rawicz, Feb. 1846.—Synod at Schneidemühl, July 1846, and final adoption there of the Confession of Faith. See *F. F. Kampe*, Das Wesen des Deutschkatholicismus, Tübing. 1850. See also (including the literature) *Niedner*, s. 926 ff., and *Herzog's* Realenc. iii. s. 350.

(14) [*Alban Butler*, born 1710, died 1773: Lives of Saints, 12 vols. 1847.—*Charles Butler*, born 1750, died 1832: Historical Memoirs of English, etc., Catholics, 4 vols. 3d ed. 1822; Confessions of Faith, 1816; Book of Rom. Cath. Church (against *Southey*), 1825, and Vindication, against *Townsend*, 1826; Horæ Biblicæ, etc.—*John Milner*, born 1752, died 1836: End of Controversy, 2d ed. 1819 (reply by Jarvis in Am.); Vindication of the same, 1822.—*Jos. Berington*, born 1743, died 1827: Letter on Hartley (see § 285*a*, note 15, above); State of English Catholics, 1780, 1787; Exposition of Rom. Cath. Principles, 1787; Rights of Dissenters, 1789. —*Richard Challoner*, Bp. of Debra, died 1781: Britannia Sacra, 1740.—*John Lingard*, died 1851: Hist. of England, new ed. 10 vols. 1849.—Cardinal *Nicholas Wiseman* (Abp. of Westminster, 1850), Lectures on Doctrines, etc., of Church of Rome, 1844; Real Presence, 1836; Science and Revealed Religion, 2d ed. 1842; Essays, 3 vols. 1853, etc.—The following went from the Oxford school to the Roman Catholic Church:—*John Henry Newman*, now a cardinal: Difficulties of Anglicans, 1850; Position of Catholics, 1851; University Education, etc. *W. G. Ward*, Ideal of Church, 1844; Anglican Establishment, 1850, contrasted with Church Catholics; Nature and Grace, 1860. *Henry E. Manning*, now Cardinal Archbp. of Westminster: Unity of Church, 1852; Sermons; Grounds of Faith, 1852.]

(15) [Bp. *John England* (S. C.), died 1842: Works, 5 vols. 1849. Prince *Galitzin*, died 1840: Defence of Catholic Principles. Abp. *John Hughes* of New York, controversial pamphlets. Abp. *F. P. Kenrick*, born 1797: Theol. dogmatica, 2 vols. 1840 (repr. in Antwerp); Theologia Moralis, 3 vols. 1842; the Primacy, 1837; Justification, 1841, Reply to Bp. Hopkins, etc.—Bp. *Spalding* (of Kentucky), on the Reformation (against Merle d'Aubigné); Miscellanies; Evidences.]

§ 288.

The Russo-Greek Church.

[*A. N. Mouravieff*, Hist. of Church of Russia, 1838, transl. by *Blackmore*, Oxf. 1842. *W. Palmer*, Dissertations on the Eastern Catholic Communion, Lond. 1852. Prince *August. Galitzin*, l'Eglise greco-russe, Paris 1861. *Waddington's* Greek Church, 1854. *Gass* in Herzog's Realencyklop. *A. P. Stanley*, Lectures on the Eastern Church, 1861, Lectures 4 to 8 on Russia. *J. W. Neale*, History of the Holy Eastern Church, Lond., 4 vols., unfinished.]

In the Russo-Greek Church *Theophanes Procopowicz* (1) and *Platon* (2) set forth the orthodox doctrines which were afterwards defended by the Imperial Councillor, *Alexander of Stourdza* (3), against the attacks of the Jesuits. But none of these exerted any influence upon the development of the doctrines of Christianity in general.

(1) *Procopowicz* was born at Kiew, A.D. 1681, died 1736, as Archbishop of Novgorod. After his death was *published* his Christiana Orthod. Theolog. tom. i.–vii. 1773–1776 ff. See *Schröckh*, Kg. (as continued by *Tzschirner*), ix. s. 207 ff.

(2) *Platon*, born 1737, became Archbishop of Moscow (1775), and died 1812. *He wrote*: Rechtgläubige Lehre, oder Kurzer Auszug der christlichen Theologie, zum Gebrauch Seiner Königlichen Hoheit des Grossfürsten Paul Petrowisch, Riga 1770 (translated into German). Comp. *Schröckh*, l.c. s. 212 ff. *Schlegel*, Kirchengesch. des 18ten Jahrhunderts, Bd. 2, s. 59 ff. [English translations of Platon by *Pinkerton*, The Present State of the Greek Church in Russia, or Summary of Christian Divinity, Lond. 1814; other transls.]

(3) Considérations sur la doctrine de l'esprit de l'église orthodoxe, Stuttg. 1816. Translated in German 1817 (by *Kotzebue*).

On the sects of the Greek Church, the Nestorians, Monophysites, and Monothelites (Maronites), as well as those who dissented from the Russian Church (from the year 1666), viz. the Staroverzi (Rascolniks) and the Duchoborzi (the Russian Quakers), comp. the works on Church history. *Hase* (7th ed.), s. 701. Deutsche Vierteljahrschrift, 1842, Nr. 19. †*Hefele*, Die russische Kirche, in Tübing. Quartalschrift, 1853, 3. [The Malakans, eating milk-food on fast-days, have become widely diffused during the present century. See Essai historique et critique sur les Sectes religieuses de la Russe, Paris 1854. Revue des deux Mondes, 1859.]

B. SPECIAL HISTORY OF DOCTRINES DURING THE FIFTH PERIOD.

FIRST DIVISION.

PROLEGOMENA. RELIGION. REVELATION. BIBLE AND TRADITION.

(MIRACLES AND PROPHECIES.)

§ 289.

Religion.

AFTER Christianity, from the time of Wolf, had ceased to be regarded as the only religion, and a distinction had been made between natural and revealed religion, it became necessary to define the latter more precisely. For a considerable time both rationalists and supernaturalists adopted the definition: *Religio est modus Deum cognoscendi et colendi* (1), with this difference, that the former made religion to consist chiefly in morality (2). *Semler* made a distinction between religion and theology (3), and *Herder* separated religion from doctrinal opinions and religious usages (4). According to *Schleiermacher*, religion consists neither in knowledge nor in action, but is a certain definite inclination and tendency of the feeling, manifesting itself as the sense of absolute dependence on God (5). Most of the modern mediating theologians rest their systems on the same principle (6). The adherents of speculative philosophy consider knowledge as the founda-

tion (7); the practical systems appeal to *conscience* as the final tribunal (8).

(1) On this point comp. *Twesten*, Dogmatik, i. s. 2, and *Nitzsch*, System, § 6. The formula is somewhat enlarged by *Ammon*, Summ. Theol. Chr. § 1: Conscientiæ vinculum, quo cogitando, volendo, et agendo numini nos obstrictos sentimus.

(2) According to *Kant*, religion consists in this, that in reference to all our duties we consider God the legislator who is to be reverenced by all. See his Religion innerhalb der Grenzen der blossen Vernunft, s. 139.

(3) *Semler*, too, confounded religion with morality (the reformation of the life). See *Tholuck*, ii. s. 111.

(4) In his treatise, Von Religion, Lehrmeinungen, und Gebräuchen, 1798. (Werke, xviii. s. 169–330.)

(5) Christliche Glaubenslehre, § 3 ff., comp. his Reden über Religion, s. 56–77. [On *Schleiermacher's* and kindred views, see *Morell's* Philosophy of Religion (1849), p. 82–106; *Strauss*, Der alte u. der neue Glaube, who regards S. as a Pantheist. It has been remarked that the word God (*Gott*) does not occur in his Lectures on Religion; but only Deity (*Gottheit*). Comp. also *Pfleiderer*, Religionsphilosophie, u. s.]

(6) *Schleiermacher's* definition was adopted by *Twesten* and *Nitzsch*, l.c., and with some modifications by *Hase*, § 2–6, and *De Wette*, Vorlesungen über die Religion, Vorles. 4. *Wegscheider* (Inst. § 2) defines religion as "æquabilis et constans *animi affectio*," etc. That this theory does not necessarily exclude knowledge, may be seen from the passages of the respective writers above referred to. Comp. also *Elwert*, Ueber das Wesen der Religion, Tübinger Zeitschrift, 1835, Heft 3. *Ch. H. Weisse*, in his Philosophische Dogmatik, oder Phil. des Christenthums (Leipz. 1855 ff., 3 vols.), comprises religion under the generic idea of "Experience" (*Erfahrung*), § 22–103. See also *S. A. Carlblom*, Das Gefühl in seiner Bedeutung für den Glauben, Berlin 1857. *Hase* defines it as "a striving after the absolute, in itself unattainable; but by love to it man becomes a partaker of the divine perfection." *Nitzsch*, § 7: "an active and passive relation of the finite consciousness to the Creator, Preserver, and Ruler of the world."

(7) See *Hegel's* Preface to *Hinrichs'* Religionsphilosophie. According to *Hegel* and *Vatke*, religion is the *process of the mind.* (*Nitzsch*, System, s. 9.) *Feuerbach* insists upon the subjective element as making the essence of religion, and then finds in this the evidence that it rests upon self-deception; theology is only anthropology, God is only a reflex of man. See his Wesen des Christenthums, s. 20: "Religion is the relation of man to himself, or more correctly, to his own nature (his subjective nature), but the relation to his own nature as if it were another nature." In reply, see *Zeller*, Ueber das Wesen der Religion, in his Theolog. Jahrbücher, 1845, s. 26 ff., 393 ff. *Biedermann*, Die freie Theologie, Tüb. 1844, s. 31–45. [Comp. Eng. translation of Feuerbach's Essence of Christianity, p. 32 ff.: "Consciousness of God is self-consciousness, knowledge of God is self-knowledge. . . . That which has no predicates or qualities has no effect upon me; that which has no effect upon me has no existence for me. To deny the qualities is to deny the being."]

(8) *J. T. Beck*, Christliche Lehrwissenschaft, i. s. 230 ff. *Ebrard*, i. s. 11. See also *J. P. Lange*, i. s. 185 ff. [*Ebrard*, "Religion is the elevation of sensibility, will, and perception into a higher and immediate unity of the God-consciousness; or the indivisible unity of blessedness, holiness, and wisdom."] *J. P. Lange* (i. s. 185 ff.) says there is a threefold relation to God; first, man recognizes God as the all-determining Spirit, and his dependence upon Him; second, gives himself to God, as a being of absolute power, goodness, and love, and in doing this attains the pure determination of his own nature; third, in this union with God he receives the true life of his own soul, etc. *Schenkel*, in opposition to Schleiermacher's theory of feeling, but still from postulates different from those of *Beck* (Dogmatik vom Standpunkte des Gewissens, Wiesbaden 1858, i. § 25 ff. § 29), makes "conscience" to be the "organ of religion" in man. "*Religion is the consciousness of the human mind, revealing itself in the conscience, that by virtue of its eternal nature, it is certain of its original and immediate personal communion with God.*" Comp. also his article, "Gewissen," in *Herzog's* Realencyklopädie, v. s. 129 ff. On the other hand, doubts have been raised as to the extension of the idea of "Conscience" (*Gewissen*), see *Hagenb.* Encykl. § 12

(7th ed.). *Jul. Köstlin*, art. "Religion," in *Herzog*, xii. s. 659. *Güder*, Die Lehre vom Gewissen (Studien u. Kritik. 1857, 2). *Schlottmann*, Ueber den Begriff des Gewissens (Deutsche Zeitschr. für Christ. Wissensch. u. Christ. Leben, 1859). *Immer*, Das Gewissen, Bern 1866.

§ 290.

Truth and Divinity of Christianity. Perfectibility. Reason and Revelation.

Notwithstanding their many differences of opinion, all Christians agreed in believing, that of all historical forms of religion, Christianity was most worthy of God, and best adapted to the religious wants of mankind. The rationalists, however, had recourse to the suppositions, either that the historical religion serves as a mere vehicle for the natural, and will at some time be resolved into it (1), or that it will gradually lose its present local and temporary character, and be perfected after the ideal formed by reason (2). On the other hand, the supernaturalists of course regarded the religion revealed in Holy Writ as complete in itself for all times. As regards the nature of revelation, and its relation to reason, the supernaturalists belonging to the earlier part of the present period conceded important rights to the latter (3). Asserting that revelation was, more properly speaking, the complement of reason, they assigned to the latter (now becoming conscious of its limits) the office of proving the possibility and necessity of revelation (4). But after *Kant* had combated the idea that reason was competent to decide what was *revealed* or not, the rationalists substituted the idea of positive (historical) religion for that of revealed religion, and maintained that the moral value of the former was to be determined by the practical reason (5). In opposition to both these systems, others assigned a more comprehensive meaning to the idea of *revelation* (6). In the opinion of some specula-

tive philosophers, it is not so much the communication of isolated and abstract ideas, as the intellectual intuition of the universal, which constitutes the essence of revelation (7). According to others (practical theologians), revelation is rather the manifestation of the divine power, which, however, does not exclude the cognitive faculties of man, though it puts them in a secondary place (8). At any rate, the idea of revelation is now taken in a more living and mobile sense than it was in the older theology, notwithstanding all the differences of present usage.

(1) *Henke,* Lineam. i. 2: Quo magis adolescunt homines . . . eo minus ponderis apud illos habet . . . auctoritas aliorum. Hinc et omnis revelata religio paullatim in rationalem transit, et eo eniti potest homo, ut alienæ institutioni non amplius fontis, sed canalis, non lucis, sed lucernæ (!) beneficium tribuat.

(2) *Lessing* suggested the idea of a perfectibility of the Christian religion in his (?) treatise, Ueber Erziehung des Menschengeschlechts. The views of *Semler* respecting the local and temporary in Christianity, and the distinction which he made between public and private religion, seem to indicate that he held the same opinion. The same may be said in reference to the work of *Teller,* Religion der Vollkommnen. Comp. *W. T. Krug,* Briefe über die Perfectibilität der geoffenbarten Religion, Jena u. Lpz. 1795, and *Ch. F. Ammon,* Die Fortbildung des Christenthums zur Weltreligion, Lpz. 2d ed. 1836–1840, 4 vols.

(3) In opposition to the Socinians, who (in strict accordance with supernaturalism) rejected the idea of natural religion, as well as to the "Fanaticos, qui dicunt, rationem esse cæcam, corruptam, hominem a Deo magis abducere, quam ad Deum adducere," the adherents of the old orthodoxy defended the use of reason in matters of religion, *e.g. Beck,* in his Fundamenta, p. 35 ss. *J. L. Frey* (professor at Basel, died 1759), De officio Doctoris Christiani, p. 33 s.: Cum enim lumen naturæ æque ac revelationis Deum patrem luminum agnoscat, nihil a Deo naturæ lumini repugnans revelari censendum est, nisi Deum sibi ipsi adversari blaspheme statuere

in animum inducamus. Imo ne ipsius quidem revelationis divinitas credi posset, si quidquam rationis lumini repugnans in illa inveniretur. Comp. *Baumgarten*, Glaubensl. Einleit.—The distinction made between articuli puri et mixti.—Advocates of modern evangelical supernaturalism have again maintained that reason is altogether blind in matters of religion (in opposition to rationalism). [The controversy which sprang out of *Mansel's* Bampton Lectures turned chiefly on the question of man's power to discern God, and the manner of revelation, Mansel advocating the views of Hamilton, and Maurice generally those of Coleridge.]

(4) Comp. *Bretschneider*, Entwicklung, etc. (new ed. 1841), § 30, and the compendiums of dogmatic theology. Comp. *Augusti*, System der Christl. Dogmatik, Lpz. 1809, § 94 ff., where (§ 96 ff.) a formal contrast is established between reason and revelation.

(5) See *Fichte*, Kritik, etc. *Tieftrunk*, Censur, s. 66 ff., s. 245 ff.

(6) According to *Herder*, the general meaning of revelation is unveiling, publication, enlightening, clear idea, perception, conviction. See the passages collected in *Herder's* Dogmatik, s. 20 ff.

(7) In the opinion of *Schelling* (Methode, s. 196), the whole of history is a divine revelation. According to *Blasche* (Philosophie der Offenbarung), revelation is equal to manifestation (§ 5). Not only history, but also natural history, belongs to the province of divine revelation (§ 22). He combats the common (supernaturalistic) view, according to which revelation is supernatural, § 43 ff. Revelation is opposed to mystery, and signifies the unveiling of mystery, while, according to the common view, revelation itself contains mysteries, § 55 ff.

(8) *Twesten*, § 24 (Bd. i. s. 340), defines revelation as the "manifestation of grace for the salvation of mankind." Comp. the whole section, and *Nitzsch*, § 23 ff. *De Wette* shows the necessity of making a distinction between revelation and the inspiration of Scripture, Dogmatik, § 26. On the difficulty of establishing precise definitions, see *Schleiermacher*, § 10. Among the more recent divines, see *J. P. Lange*, i. s. 385 ff. *Martensen* (ed. of 1836), s. 49 ff.; *Ch. H. Weisse*, § 104–179.

On *Hermes* and *Bautain* in the Catholic Church, see § 287. Comp. *H. Ulrici*, Glauben und Wissen, Speculation und exacte Wissenschaft, Lpz. 1858. *Rothe*, Zur Dogmatik, 1863, s. 55 ff., and *Julius Köstlin* in *Herzog*, l.c. [*Froude's* Nemesis of Faith, Lond. 1849. *F. W. Newman*, Phases of Faith, 1850. *H. Rogers*, Eclipse of Faith, 1852.—The controversy between Traditionalism and Rationalism in the Rom. Cath. Church led to the publication of four propositions by the Holy See, on Reason and Faith, Dec. 12, 1855. Comp. Dr. *Temple's* essay, The Education of the World, in Essays and Reviews, p. 1 ff.]

§ 291.

The Word of God. Scripture and Tradition. Scripture and Spirit.

During the preceding period Protestant theologians had been accustomed to call the sacred Scriptures themselves the Word of God; in the course of the present period the distinction was enforced between *the Word of God contained in Holy Writ* and the Scriptures themselves (1). The rationalists themselves, however, retained the (negative) principle of Protestantism, that the sacred Scriptures are a purer source of knowledge than tradition (2). Only *Lessing* drew attention to the fact that tradition is older than Holy Writ (3). Some modern theologians endeavoured to determine precisely the relation in which these two stand to each other, and showed that their difference is more relative than absolute (4). *Puseyism* made the attempt to enforce the authority of tradition in the old Catholic sense (5). By the "Protestant Friends" the question: Scripture, or Spirit? was decided in a sense which gave the most unlicensed play to subjective opinions (6).

(1) There were hints of this even in the age of the Reformation; see *Schenkel*, i. § 13. The distinction was first made prominent by *J. G. Töllner* (died 1774), Der Unter-

schied der heiligen Schrift und des Wortes Gottes, in his Miscellaneous Essays, Frankf. 1767, s. 85 ff. He shows, from the language of Scripture itself, that by the *Word of God* we are not to understand the Scriptures; on the other hand, there are some things in Holy Writ which do not belong to the Word of God (such as purely historical events), although all in it has respect to the Word of God; and, in connection with it, that not all parts of Holy Writ are equally rich in the Word of God. Töllner goes still farther, and maintains that the Word of God is not limited to the sacred Scriptures, but also exists elsewhere; for he who propounds divine truth, propounds the Word of God. It is further contained in reason, and may be found in all the different forms of religion known among mankind, though Christians possess the Word of God in its most excellent, most perfect and clearest form in the sacred Scriptures.—*Herder* directed the attention of theologians to what may be called the *human* aspect of Scripture (Briefe über das Studium der Theologie, Brief i., and in his Spirit of Hebrew Poetry; in his essay, Vom Geist des Christenthums, and in other works).

(2) The rationalists often ventured to maintain that their system alone was in *accordance with Scripture*, and rejected the ecclesiastical development of doctrines, and the symbolical definitions, as contrary to the principle of Protestantism.

(3) *Lessing* (in his controversy with Götze) appealed to the Reguli Fidei in its earliest sense, which existed previous to the written Word. Comp. his collected works, vi., vii.; Theolog. Nachlass, s. 115 ff. *Delbrück* revived this idea in his work, Phil. Melanchthon, Der Glaubenslehrer, Bonn 1826. He was opposed by *Sack*, *Nitzsch*, and *Lücke*, Bonn 1827.

(4) *Pelt*, in the first part of the Theologische Mitarbeiten, Kiel 1830. *Schenkel*, Ueber das ursprüngliche Verhältniss der Kirche zum Kanon, Basel 1838. Compare with this work the modern compendiums of dogmatic theology, *e.g.* *Twesten*, i. s. 115–119, 128–130, 288. *Marheinecke*, Symbolik, ii. s. 187 ff. The critical researches respecting the origin of the Canon (from the time of Semler) rendered the distinction between Scripture and tradition more indefinite. Comp. *Holtzmann*, Kanon und tradition, Ludwigsburg 1859. *Reuss*, Histoire du Canon des écritures saintes, Strasb. 1863.

(5) See *Keble*, On Primitive Tradition. Compare the German work of *Weaver-Amthor*, ubi supra, s. 10 ff. The tradition of the first six centuries was assumed as incorrupt. Among the German theologians, *Daniel* in his "Kontroversen," Halle 1843, approximates most closely to the Oxford school: in reply, see *Jacobi*, Die Kirchliche Lehre von der Tradition und heiliger Schrift, Berl. 1847. [On the German Neo-Lutheran school, comp. *C. Schwartz*, zur Geschichte der neusten Theologie, Leipz. 1856.]

(6) *Wislicenus*, Ob Schrift, ob Geist? 2 Aufl. 1845, and the writings in this controversy (comp. *Bruns* and *Häfners* Repert. vi. etc.).—*Scherer* in several articles in the Rev. de Theol. (see § 285, note 11). *Tholuck* in the Zeitschrift f. Christl. Wissenschaft, 1850, Nr. 16–18, 42–44. In reply, *Stier* in the same journal, 1850, Nr. 21. [*Tholuck's* Essay, translated in Journal of Sacred Lit., July 1854; his reply to *Stier* in Zeitschrift f. Christl. Wiss. 1851. Comp. the works of *Irons*, u. s.]

§ 292.

Inspiration of Scripture. Interpretation. Miracles and Prophecy.

The critical treatment of the sacred Scriptures gradually undermined the authority of the former rigid theory of inspiration. For a time commentators sought to remove all difficulties by the application of the principle of accommodation (1), or by an arbitrary exegesis (2); but at last the Rationalists found themselves compelled by a more unbiassed system of interpretation to acknowledge that even Christ and His apostles might have erred, at least in those things which do not constitute the essential parts of religion. This was the case especially with the miracles and prophecies, to which the former apologists had appealed in support of their views. After they had in vain endeavoured to explain them away by artificial modes of interpretation, they were compelled to assert that the sacred writers had a different point of view

from that of modern theologians; thus renouncing the absolute authority of their writings (3). The adherents of the mediating theology sought to avoid these difficulties, by affixing to the idea of *inspiration* (4), as well as to that of *miracle* (5) and of *prophecy* (6), a freer, more comprehensive, and more spiritual sense. At the same time they introduced much that was indefinite, which is not yet fully cleared up; but the continuous labour bestowed upon the question, if undertaken in a spirit of freedom and devoutness, can only prove advantageous to science.

(1) The theory of accommodation was principally applied to the demoniacal and miraculous; Christ and His apostles accommodated themselves to the weaknesses and prejudices of their contemporaries. Comp. *Senf*, Versuch über die Herablassung Gottes in der christlichen Religion, Halle 1792. *P. van Hemmert*, Ueber Accommodation im N. Test., translated from the Dutch, Dortm. u. Lpz. 1797. *Vogel*, Aufsätze theologischen Inhalts, Nürnb. 1799, 2d part; and several others. This theory was combated by *Süsskind*, Ueber die Grenzen der Pflicht, keine Unwarheit zu sagen, im Magazin St. 13. *Heringa*, Ueber die Lehre Jesu und seiner Apostel, translated from the Dutch, Offenb. 1792. For more particulars as to the literature on both sides, comp. *Bretschneider*, Entwickl. s. 138 ff.

(2) The Rationalists are sometimes unjustly blamed, as if they alone had made use of that arbitrary mode of interpretation (explaining Christ's miracles as natural events, by *Paulus* and others). There were also supernaturalistic and biblical theologians, as *Storr*, who had recourse to a most artificial exegesis, in order to remove differences in the various accounts of one and the same event, etc., which appeared contrary to the theory of verbal inspiration. (For example, to take ἵνα ἐκβατικῶς, in the appeal to Messianic passages which are not strictly such.)—*Kant* introduced the system of moral interpretation, according to which preachers and schoolmasters ought to explain Scripture, untroubled by its original historical meaning, in such a manner as is likely to prove useful to the moral condition of the people; and also to put such useful

matter into passages which do not contain it; see his Religion innerhalb der Grenzen der blossen Vernunft, s. 149 ff. His theory was opposed by *Rosenmüller* (Erlangen, 1794). In addition to the grammatico-historical system of interpretation which has been adopted by most modern commentators, *Germar* made use of the panharmonic, *Olshausen* and *Stier* of the allegorical, mode of interpretation. On these attempts, comp. the full discussion by *Hermann Schultz* in the Studien u. Kritiken, 1866, 1: Ueber doppelten Schriftsinn.

(3) *Henke*, Lineamenta, c. 15. *Wegscheider*, Institutiones, § 44. *Tzschirner*, Dogmatik, c. ii. § 6. Different from this is the hypothesis, so much favoured in recent times, on the alleged tendencies and aims of the biblical (particularly the New Testament) writers, as carried out in all its modulations, especially by the school of Tübingen. See in opposition, *Weisse*, Phil. Dogmatik, i. s. 151.

(4) Some Supernaturalists also admitted that the sacred penmen, in writing concerning things not essential (*i.e.* not referring to religion), represented them according to their best knowledge and ability; see *Reinhard*, Dogmatik, s. 59 (56); *Storr*, Dogmatik, § 11. In the same way the adherents of the mediating theology agree with the Rationalists in opposing the theory of verbal inspiration. This was the case particularly with *Herder*, who, on the other hand, expressed himself with enthusiasm in favour of that which is truly inspired; comp. his essays, Vom Geist des Christenthums, Von der Gabe der Sprachen, etc. (Dogmatik, s. 91 ff.); *Twesten*, i. s. 414 ff. Rationalism not only gave up unconditional faith in the authority of the Scriptures, but also the belief that the Scriptures have normal authority in respect to *religious truth*; the mediating theology upheld their authority in this later aspect, by regarding the New Testament writings as the primitive productions of the Holy Spirit under the Christian dispensation, to which all later works stand in the same relation in which copies stand to the original. Comp. *Schleiermacher*, Christlicher Glaube, ii. s. 340 ff. According to *De Wette* (Dogmatik, s. 40), the essential part of interpretation is "the religious sense of the divine working, or of the divine spirit in the sacred writers, solely in regard to their belief and elevation of soul, not having respect to the forma-

tion of their ideas," etc. Comp. *Hase*, § 455. *Billroth*, who belonged to the speculative school, expressed himself as follows (Pref. to his Comm. on the Ep. to the Corinthians, s. vii.): "It is the object of systematic theology to comprehend that which is truly *rational*, even the *Spirit* which manifests itself in the Christian religion. But since this Spirit has assumed a *temporal form* in the revelation of God, it was of course received by men whose education was influenced by the peculiar circumstances of their age. These men were, in the first instance, the apostles," etc. Comp. *Marheinecke*, Dogmatik, s. 358 ff.—Whoever, with *Strauss* (Glaubenslehre, Bd. i. s. 179, Anm.), looks upon such a recurrence to the first times of Christianity as a sinking back into the unspiritual, will of course see in this the end of the history of the dogma of inspiration. Comp. *Schelling* (Methode des akad. Studiums, s. 198): "One should think that the teachers of the Christian religion would be thankful to those in later times, who have derived so much speculative material from the scanty contents of the first religious writings, and shaped them into a system." *Hegel*, Phil. d. Relig. iii. 111: "The biblical text contains the mode in which Christianity first appeared—this it describes: yet this cannot give us in an explicit form what is latent in the principle of Christianity, but only a presentiment thereof;" cited by *Strauss*, u. s. Compare *Rothe*, Zur Dogmatik. French orthodoxy has as yet adhered more strictly than the German to the theory of verbal inspiration. *Gasparin* and *Gaussen* are its chief representatives. In opposition, we find in recent times not only the rationalistic tendency of *Scherer* and the *Revue Protestante*, but also more liberal views from the camp of the "believers." Comp. *Fréd. de Rougemont*, Christ et ses Témoins, Paris 1856, 2 vols. Thus in vol. i. p. 426: La Révélation de Jésus Christ qui est la vie, et dont l'Esprit vit dans l'Eglise, ne suppose point nécessairement un document écrit. ii. p. 161: On détruit la Révélation quand on la transforme en un système de vérités abstraites. . . . Voulons-nous nous faire une idée d'une religion d'abstractions: prenons le Koran. Yet still he teaches the strictest subordination of reason to *revelation*, which he distinguishes from inspiration. [In the English and American theology the

strict theory of verbal inspiration is defended by *John Dick*, Essay on Inspiration, 4th ed., Glasg. 1840; *R. S. Candlish*, Authority and Insp. of Script. 1851; *Chr. Wordsworth* on Insp. 2d ed. 1851, and Lectures in Westminster Abbey, 1861. *Coleridge*, in his Confessions of an Inquiring Spirit, 1831, opposed the verbal accuracy of the Scriptures. *Morell*, in his Philos. of Religion, restricted inspiration to intuitional truth (comp. *Thornwell*, in South. Presb. Quart., April 1856). —*F. W. Newman*, *Gregg*, and *Theodore Parker* identify inspiration with the elevation of the soul by spiritual truth. *Heurtley*, Lect. Univ. Oxf. 1861; *B. F. Westcott*, Introduction to Gospels, 1860, p. 5–37, 383 ff.—See especially *William Lee*, The Inspiration of Holy Scripture, its Nature and Proof, 1854.] A considerable advance was made in this question by the Essay of *Rothe*, at first published in the Studien u. Kritiken, and afterwards separately, Gotha 1863, s. 5 ff., and s. 121 ff.

(5) From the time of *Spinoza* (Tract. Theol. polit. c. 6, De Miraculis) and *Hume*, the rationalists did not cease to oppose the reality and credibility of miracles, while the adherents of the modern (formal) supernaturalism rested belief in revelation especially on that branch of evidence; in this they differed, *e.g.*, from Luther, comp. *Hase*, Dogmatik, s. 207. The theory of preformation advanced by *Bonnet* (according to which God has *a priori* included the miracles in the course of nature) did not meet with general approbation; see his "Philosophische Untersuchungen," etc., edited by *Lavater*, Zürich 1768. The modern theory of *Olshausen*, who regards the miracles as a quickening of the processes of nature, bears some resemblance to the preceding. *Lavater* believed that miracles are still taking place. According to the philosophy of Kant, it is neither possible absolutely to prove the *reality* of miracles, nor can their *possibility* be absolutely denied (a difference is made between logical, physical, and moral possibility); see *Tieftrunk*, s. 245 ff. (*Kant*, Religion innerhalb der Grenzen der blossen Vernunft, s. 107 ff.) The rationalists endeavoured to explain the miraculous as something natural, while the natural philosophers asserted that nature transfigured by spirit (the blending of the two in one) is the only genuine miracle. But thus the reality of the miracle (in the Scriptural sense) was destroyed,

and it was regarded as the symbolical expression of a speculative idea. See *Schelling*, Methode, s. 181, 203, and comp. *Bockshammer* and *Rosenkranz*, cited in *Strauss*, Dogmatik, s. 244 ff. The *natural* interpretation of miracles rather served the purposes of rationalism, while the adherents of modern speculative philosophy gave the preference to the hypothesis that the miracles related in Scripture are myths, because it is more agreeable to the negative critical tendency of that school. This hypothesis was most fully developed by *Strauss* in his Leben Jesu. [*Strauss'* Life of Jesus, transl. 3 vols. 1836.] The adherents of the mediation theology used a more liberal but also considerate and cautious mode of reasoning, in defending the credibility of the historical relations of the sacred writers. But some of them, as *De Wette* and *Schleiermacher*, also admit mythical elements. As regards the idea of miracle itself, they make a distinction between the objective and the subjective, and, generally speaking, adopt the principle of Augustine, who did not regard a miracle as something merely supernatural (comp. above, § 118, note 1). See *Schleiermacher*, i. s. 120; *De Wette*, s. 34; *Twesten*, i. s. 357 ff., and *Nitzsch*, s. 64, are more inclined to admit miracles in the distinctive sense of the word. The literature is more fully given by *Bretschneider*, Entwurf, s. 235 ff. Comp. also the views of *Herder* on this point, Dogmatik, s. 60, the poetical view of miracles.—A new construction of the idea of miracles in *Weisse*, Phil. Dogmatik, §§ 119–127. [He says that the general notion of miracle comprises all the acts by which God revealed Himself to His people, and guided their destinies; the giving of the law was the great miracle under the Old Testament. He admits, however, that there are mythical elements in the history. And *Trench* holds not so much that the miracle proves the doctrine, but rather the converse, although both unite. *Baden Powell*, in his Order of Nature, 1859, and his essay on the Evidences (in the Essays and Reviews, 1860), attacks the whole argument from miracles. He was answered by *H. L. Mansel*, in Aids to Faith, 1861.] *Rothe* (Zur Dogmatik, s. 80 ff.): "*Where miracles and prophecies are found, there God is evidently, and God can thus manifest Himself only through miracles and prophecies which He works. It is therefore an inexact and misleading form of*

expression, when it is said that revelation is accompanied by miracles and prophecies. Rather does it consist in miracles and prophecies" (s. 82).

(6) Among orthodox theologians, *Bengel* and *Crusius* in particular treated of prophetic theology, and attached great importance not only to the prophecies, but also to the types of the Old Testament (comp. § 277). The later supernaturalists did not go quite so far. After the antiquity of some prophecies (*e.g.* those of Daniel) had been impugned, and the Messianic prophecies had been referred to other historical events, the rationalists at last maintained that in the Old Testament there are no prophecies at all referring to Christ, to say nothing of the types. See *Eckermann*, Theolog. Beiträge, i. 1, s. 7 ff., and comp. the literature given by *Bretschneider*, Entwurf, s. 207 ff. The adherents of the mediation-theology did not pay so much attention to the announcement of particular and merely incidental events as to the internal necessity of the historical development of the kingdom of heaven, in which the earlier periods are prophetic of those which take place in later times, and according to which everything finds its higher fulfilment in Christ, the centre of the history of the world. See *Herder*, Dogmatik, s. 196 ff. *Schleiermacher*, Darstellung des theologischen Studiums, § 46; Glaubensl. i. s. 105. There is, however, a difference of opinion between *Twesten*, i. s. 372 ff., and *Nitzsch*, s. 66, on the one hand, and *De Wette*, s. 36 (§ 24*b*), and *Hase*, s. 209, on the other.—*Hofmann*, in his Weissagung und Erfüllung (Nördlingen 1841–1844, 2 vols.), and in his Schriftbeweis, 1852, 1859, endeavours (in the sense of a speculative mysticism) to give a profounder view of the idea of prophecy. *Lutz* (1849) represents a cautious hermeneutics; see particularly 2 Divis. C. 1 and 2. [Comp. *Delitzsch*, Bibl.-proph. Theologie, 1845. *Tholuck*, Die Propheten und ihre Weissagungen, 2te Aufl. 1861. *Hengstenberg's* Christology, transl. by *Reuel Keith*, in Clark's For. Theol. Lib. 4 vols. The Messianic prophecies are also fully discussed in *John Pye Smith's* Scripture Testimony, 3 vols. Among the older works, see *John Davison* (died 1834), Disc. on Prophecy, delivered at the Warburtonian Lecture, 1825; more recent works by *Fairbairn*, *Riehm*, and *Gloag* (Edinr.).]

The views of *Swedenborg* concerning the nature and significance of the *Scriptures* were peculiar; see *Hauber*, Swedenborgs Ansicht von der heiligen Schrift (Tübinger Zeitschrift, 1840, 4, s. 32 ff.). He regarded (like the supernaturalists) the Scriptures as the Word of God, but he differed from the latter in applying this appellation not to what we commonly call the sacred Scriptures, but to another Scripture antecedent to ours, viz. the Scripture of angels, which is both antecedent and superior to the terrestrial. As regards the empirical Scriptures, he has his own Canon (comp. *Hauber*, s. 80); and in the books which he admits as canonical, he makes a distinction between those passages in which God Himself speaks (quando e cathedra loquitur), and those in which angels speak in His name. But even in these cases a *new revelation* is necessary, that the *spiritual* meaning of Scripture may be apprehended by all readers. This spiritual sense, too, is a sense *before* the sense, to which we cannot attain by rising from beneath upward, but which must be imparted from above downwards.—Play with symbols and analogies.—Swedenborg's doctrine respecting the Scriptures was closely connected with his Christological views.—On *Oetinger's* "massive" views of Scripture, see the Preliminaries to his Theology (Stuttg. 1842), and *Auberlen*, s. 333 ff. et passim.

As regards the relation in which the Old Testament stands to the New, we find that those rationalists who, after the example of Kant, regarded the sacred Scriptures merely as a means of edification, made but a slight distinction between the one and the other, because there was in the Old Test. (*e.g.* in the Book of Proverbs) much that was subservient to moral purposes. Nor did they concern themselves much about the difference between canonical and apocryphal writings (some even preferred the Book of Jesus the son of Sirach to the writings of Paul and John).—But even some orthodox theologians were induced, by idealistic and poetical tendencies, to give the preference to the Old Testament. Thus *Herder* is manifestly more supranaturalistic in respect to the Old Testament than to the New. *De Wette*, too, was inclined to concede to the Old Test. (so far as religion must assume an æsthetic form), on account of its sacred poetry, a higher rank than to the New (see his Religion und Theologie, s. 212 ff.). *Umbreit* also has this tendency in a special degree.—On the other hand, some rationalists attached greater importance to the New Testament. Comp. *Wegscheider*, t. i. c. 1. § 32. *Schleiermacher*, in harmony with his entire theological system, ascribed didactic authority to the New Testament alone, asserting that the Old Testament has only historical significance; Glaubenslehre, ii. § 131. The advocates of modern supernaturalism have again attached special importance to the Old Testament, and written elaborate expositions of its Christology and Eschatology (*e.g. Hengstenberg, Hävernik, Auberlen, Hofmann, Kurtz, Delitzsch, Baumgarten*). On the other hand, a more critical and historical point of view has been taken by *Bleek, Hitzig, Vatke, Knobel, Stähelin*, and others; while *Ewald* represents a peculiar tendency, which can hardly be included in the ordinary categories.

SECOND DIVISION.

THEOLOGY PROPER. CREATION AND PROVIDENCE. THE DOCTRINE CONCERNING ANGELS AND DEVILS.

§ 293.

Deism. Theism. Pantheism.

THE contrast between Rationalism and the earlier Supernaturalism manifested itself less distinctly in the doctrine concerning God, and the relation in which He stands to the world. The adherents of both systems retained the theistic distinction between God and the world, though they often degenerated into a dead and mechanical deism. There was, however, this difference, that the supernaturalist admitted occasional acts of interference on the part of God in the workings of the machine, which otherwise ran on of itself in its regular course (1), while this was denied by the more consistent Rationalists. Of greater importance is the distinction between this theistico-deistic theory and the pantheistic system (2). The latter in some cases has shown itself partly as pure pantheism (atheistic in fact), sometimes as theism, which has the appearance of pantheism only as contrasted with the dead deism referred to (3).

(1) Thus in the case of answers granted to prayer and of miracles. Compare the mechanical theory of miracles propounded by *Reinhard*, s. 230 ff.

(2) Pantheism has been very differently defined. Accord-

ing to *Wegscheider* (Inst. § 57), Pantheism is: Ea sententia, qua naturam divinam mundo supponunt et Deum ac mundum unum idemque esse statuunt. Both rationalists and supernaturalists have, on moral grounds, combated this kind of pantheism, even the mere appearance of it; the adherents of the speculative philosophy, however, rejected this definition: see *Hegel*, Encykl. 2d ed. s. 521. [*Böhmer* (De Pantheismi Nominis origine, Halæ 1851) says that the word pantheism was first used in the title to one of Toland's books, 1705. It is not alluded to by Bentley or Bayle.—*Weissenborn* (Vorll. üb. Pantheismus u. Theismus, Marb. 1859) defines pantheism as the system which identifies God and the *all of things*, or the *unity of things*. There have been six forms: 1. Mechanical, or materialistic—God the mechanical unity of existence. 2. Ontological (abstract unity) pantheism—the one substance in all; Spinoza. 3. Dynamic pantheism. 4. Psychical pantheism —God the soul of the world. 5. Ethical pantheism—God the universal moral order; Fichte. 6. Logical pantheism; Hegel.] The school of Hegel prefers to describe its system as that of immanence.

(3) Thus *Herder* said of *Spinoza:* He was an archtheist before all theists (Dogmatik, s. 129. Comp. his discourses, especially that on God). A controversy was carried on respecting the Pantheism of *Schleiermacher* (as seen particularly in his Reden über Religion): he was charged with holding pantheistic principles by *Röhr*, but defended by *Karsten* (Rostock 1835). *Henke* pronounced a more favourable opinion respecting the theistico-pantheistic tendency:—Lineam. § xxxi.: Summa autem injuria omnes illi Atheorum numero accensentur, qui summum Numen ab hoc universo secretum ac disparatum cogitare nesciunt, maluntque Deum rerum omnium causam *immanentem* quam *transeuntem* dici, nec tamen id, quod perpetuo *est*, commiscent cum illo, quod perpetuo *fit*. Quorum error, profecto magis fanaticus quam impius, *Pantheismus* et *Spinozismus* vocatur, si modo error est Numinis, omnibus rebus præsentissimi cogitatio, a qua neque ipse Paulus admodum abhorruisse videtur (Acts xvii. 27–29) et quæ amice satis conciliari potest cum Numinis moribus intelligentium naturarum providentis notione. Comp. *Hase*, Dogmatik, s. 150.—Modern orthodox theologians and philo-

sophers are labouring so to represent the doctrine of a self-conscious (personal) God, that we may apprehend Him neither (in the manner of the deists) as existing *without* and *separate from* the world; nor (in the manner of the pantheists) as existing merely *in* and wholly *connected with* the world; but (in the manner of the theists) as a being that exists at the same time *in and above the world*, and yet *distinct from the world*. That the Hegelian school, of the so-called left side, lays such stress upon the immanence theory that the personality of God disappears, is a reproach which is made against them without injustice. Comp. *J. F. Romang*, Der neueste Pantheismus oder die junghegel'sche Weltanschauung, Zürich 1848. Atheism comes out naked and unveiled in *Feuerbach's* Essence of Christianity, s. 20: "The divine essence is nothing but human nature, or, better still, the nature of man purified, freed from the limits of the individual man, and viewed objectively, *i.e.* contemplated and reverenced as another nature, distinguished from man. All determinations (definitions) of the divine nature are therefore human determinations."[1] On the very wavering idea of "Pantheism," which has caused more perplexity to both sides in these controversies than is justified by the understanding of its meaning, compare *Ed. Böhmer*, De Pantheismi nominis origine et usu et notione, Hal. 1851; *G. Weissenborn*, Vorlesungen über Pantheismus u. Theismus, Marb. 1859; *Ulrici*, in *Herzog's* Realenc. xi. s. 64 ff.

§ 294.

The Existence and Attributes of God.

Up to the time of *Kant*, theologians continued to prove the existence of God much in the same way as had been done in former periods, some laying greater stress upon one mode of proof, others endeavouring to demonstrate the

[1] The materialism represented by *Vogt*, *Moleschott*, *Büchner*, and others, lies of course outside the History of Doctrines. [The chief work of *Moleschott* is his Kreislauf des Lebens, 1852. *Vogt*, Köhlerglaube und Wissenschaft, 4te Aufl. 1856. *L. Büchner*, Kraft und Stoff, 2te Aufl. 1858; and, Natur und Geist, 1857.]

superiority of another (1). But after *Kant* showed that the usual arguments do not establish what they are intended to prove (2), and had substituted the *moral* argument in their place (3), these proofs gradually disappeared from German science. The *physico-theological* proof, however, was retained, because of its fitness for the instruction of the people and of the young (4). *Schleiermacher* returned to man's original consciousness of God, which is antecedent to all proofs (5), and most modern theologians followed his example; while the adherents of speculative philosophy again pointed out the more profound significance of the former arguments (6). The same may be said of the divine attributes (7) which Schleiermacher regarded as subjective, *i.e.* as the reflex of the consciousness of God in man (8). On the other hand, the speculative philosophers ascribed to them reality, though in a different sense from that commonly attached to this expression (9).

(1) *Fénélon*, Démonstration de l'Existence de Dieu, Par. 1712. The *ontological* proof was propounded by *Mendelssohn*, Morgenstunden, Berlin 1785, and others; the *cosmological*, by *Baumgarten*, Glaubenslehre, i. (Appendix to Art. 1, § 13, s. 923); the *physico-theological*, by *Derham*, Physico-theology, or a Demonstration of the Being and Attributes of God from His Works, Lond. 1714; *Sander*, *Bonnet*, and many others.

(2) In his Kritik der reinen Vernunft, iii. 3, s. 611 ff. (3d ed. Riga 1790). In his opinion, the existence of God can be proved on speculative grounds only in a threefold manner; either by the physico-theological, or the cosmological, or the ontological argument. These are the only modes of argumentation, nor is it possible that there should be more.—*The ontological proof is not admissible*, because its advocates confound a logical predicate with a real. "A hundred real dollars do not contain anything more than a hundred possible. . . . But in reference to my property a hundred real dollars are more than the mere idea of that sum (*i.e.* of its possibility)." . . . "The idea of a supreme being is in many

respects a very profitable idea; but because it is a *mere idea*, it cannot by itself enlarge our knowledge of that which exists;" for a "man might as well increase his knowledge by mere ideas, as a merchant augment his property by adding some ciphers to the sum total on his books." (Comp. *Gaunilo* against Anselm, above, vol. ii.) *In opposition to the cosmological proof*, he urged that "its advocates commit an Ignoratio elenchi, *i.e.* they promise to show us a new way, but bring us back to the old (ontological) proof, because their argument is also founded on a dialectic fiction." *In reference to the physico-theological proof*, he said: "This argument should always be named with respect. It is the oldest, clearest, and most adapted to common sense. It enlivens the study of nature, from which also it derives its existence, and through which it obtains new vigour. It shows to us objects and designs where we should not have discovered these by independent observation, and enlarges our knowledge of nature by making us acquainted with a special unity whose principle is above nature. But this knowledge exerts a reacting influence upon its cause, viz. the idea from which it derives its origin; and thus it confirms the belief in a supreme Creator, so that it becomes an irresistible conviction.—Nevertheless, this argument cannot secure demonstrative certainty: at the utmost it might prove the existence of a *builder of the world*, but not of a *creator of the world*."

(3) Comp. Raymund of Sabunde, above. *Kant*, Kritik der reinen Vernunft, s. 832 ff.; Kritik der praktischen Vernunft, s. 223 ff. Morality and a degree of happiness befitting it are the two elements which constitute the supreme good. But the virtuous do not always attain to happiness. There must therefore be a compensation in the world to come. (Thus the same argument is used to prove the immortality of the soul.) At the same time, there must be a being that possesses both the requisite intelligence and the will to bring about this compensation. Hence the existence of God is a postulate of the practical reason.

(4) Especially in England. *W. Paley*, Natural Theology, or Evidences of the existence and attributes of the Deity, 16th ed. 1817; translated into German, Mannh. 1823; with additions by *Lord Brougham* and *Sir Charles Bell*, trans-

lated into German by *Hauff*, Stuttg. 1837. The Bridgewater Treatises, 1836 ff. Comp. *W. Müller*, Kritik des physico-theologischen Beweises, in Röhrs Magazin, Bd. iv. Heft 1, 1831, s. 1–35.

(5) Glaubenslehre, i. § 32 ff.

(6) *Hegel*, Vorlesungen über die Beweise vom Dasein Gottes; Appendix to the second volume of his Philosophy of Religion. *Strauss*, Dogmatik, i. s. 400: "The cosmological argument proves God to be the being existing in all being; the physico-theological shows Him to be the life existing in all that lives; the historical and moral arguments prove that He is the moral governor of the world; and lastly, the ontological shows that He is the Spirit existing in all spirits, the Thought in all thinking beings." Comp. *Weisse*, Phil. Dogmatik, i. §§ 296–366.

(7) *Reinhard*, Dogmatik, s. 90 ff., divided the attributes of God into quiescent and active attributes, etc. *Bruch* attempted a new revision of the theory of the attributes in his Lehre von den göttlichen Eigenschaften, Hamb. 1842. For further statements, see *Nitzsch*, in the article "*Gott*," in *Herzog's* Realenc. v. 261 ff. [In new ed. by *Köstlin*.] *Dorner*, in Jahrbb. f. deutsche Theologie, 1859, 1860.

(8) Glaubenslehre, i. § 50.

(9) *Hegel*, Encyklopädie, i. § 36, s. 73 (in *Strauss*, Dogmatik, i. s. 542). Comp. *J. P. Lange*, ii. 1, s. 60 ff.; *Ebrard*, i. s. 219 ff. *Weisse*, §§ 482–537.

§ 295.

The Doctrine of the Trinity.

Lücke, Die immanente Wesenstrinität, in the Studien und Kritiken, 1840, 1. In reply, *Nitzsch*, ibid. 1841, s. 332 ff.

Although the Church doctrine of the Trinity had not been disturbed during the period of the Reformation, it was now attacked by numerous opponents. Not only did Arianism make its appearance in England, as an isolated phenomenon, but various modifications of Socinianism also found their way

into German theology (1). The rationalists were, properly speaking, pure Unitarians (2); on the other hand, decided supernaturalists, the more they planted themselves on the *Biblical* standpoint, yielded somewhat of the strict doctrine of *ecclesiastical* orthodoxy (3). *Swedenborg* found the Trinity in the person of Christ (4). The adherents of the school of *Zinzendorf* exposed themselves to the charge of destroying the relation in which the persons stand to each other, by paying excessive homage to the Son (5). Modern theologians have again apprehended the more profound speculative basis of the doctrine; but while some (after the example of *Schleiermacher*) refer the Trinity, like Sabellius, to the threefold revelation of Deity (6); others (both the purely speculative and the strictly orthodox) think that it has respect to the essence of the Deity (7). The place which they assign to the doctrine of the Trinity in their systems, and the degree of importance which they attach to it, depend upon their views in these respects (8).

(1) *Samuel Clarke* was dismissed from his post as Queen's chaplain (1714) in the reign of Queen Anne, on account of his work concerning the Trinity (1712). He maintained that the Son was subordinate to the Father, and the Holy Spirit to both the Father and the Son; nor did he afterwards alter his opinion. Comp. *Schlegel*, Kg. des 18 Jahrhund. ii. s. 746 ff.—*J. J. Wetstein* compared the Son of God to a prime minister, and His relation to the Father to that of a prime minister to a monarch, or of a curate to his rector; see *Hagenbach*, Ueber Wetstein in Illgens Zeitschrift für historische Theologie. The theory of subordination was also adopted by other German theologians. See *Töllner*, Theologische Untersuchungen, 1762, vol. i. part 1. He combated the opinion that the doctrine of the Trinity is a fundamental doctrine; see his Vermischte Aufsätze, ii. 1.

(2) According to *Wegscheider* (Inst. § 93), the doctrine of the Trinity belongs to those doctrines, quæ justa auctoritate certoque fundamento destituta sunt; comp. *Henke*, Lineam. lxix.

(3) Thus *J. A. Urlsperger*, Kurzgefasstes System seines Vortrags von Gottes Dreieinigkeit, Augsb. 1777.—The author of this work maintained that the divine predicates, *Father*, *Son*, and *Spirit*, are simply "economical," and have reference only to the work of redemption (Trinity of revelation); he did not deny a Trinity of nature, which he was willing to adore as a mystery, but he rejected the idea that Father, Son, and Spirit are its necessary and personal predicates.

(4) According to *Swedenborg*, instead of a Trinity of *persons* (as taught in the symbols of the Church), we must hold a Trinity of the *person*, by which he understood, that that which is divine in Christ is the *Father*, that the divine united with the human is the *Son*, and the divine which proceeds from Him is the *Holy Spirit*. The first Christians, in their simplicity, believed in *three* persons, because they understood everything in its literal sense. The orthodox Trinitarians may also go to heaven, where they will be enlightened on this subject. But no one can be admitted into heaven who believes in the existence of *three Gods*, though with his mouth he may confess only *one;* for the entire life of heaven, and the wisdom of all the angels, is founded on the recognition and confession of *One* God, and on the belief that that *One* God is also man; and that He who is at the same time God and man, is the Lord (Jehovah, Zebaoth, Shaddai). See his Divine Revelation, i. (Die Lehre des neuen Jerusalem vom Herrn, edit. by *Tafel*, 1823) s. 118 ff. [This and his other works are published by the Swedenborg Society, in English.]

(5) See *Bengel*, Abriss der sogen. Brüdergem. s. 74 f.: "Can any one approve of the doctrine of Zinzendorf, who refuses to attribute the work of creation to the Father, and maintains that He (the Father) was either ministering to and assisting His Son, or looking at His work, or enjoying divine rest, while the latter was creating the world? *who further ascribes so many other things which also belong to the Father, to the Son alone?* who also ascribes to the Holy Ghost a kind of motherhood as a personal characteristic? and, lastly, who treats, in so presumptuous a way, the heavenly doctrine of the ever-blessed Godhead?" s. 119: "We ought not to slip over the Son, but neither also the Father, as if He were of no account. The latter, compared with the former, is a new, and

hence a great pleasure for the devil."—Bengel also finds fault with the *familiar* style in which Zinzendorf treated this mystery, as he spoke of a holy family in the Trinity, and did not shrink from comparing God the Father to a grandfather.[1] These extravagances *Spangenberg*, however, happily set aside. In the Idea Fidei Fratrum is no particular locus de *Trinitate*, but a section concerning the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost (§ 84). The doctrine in question is there simply treated in its scriptural aspects, to which is added: "It is not only vain and foolish, but also dangerous, to descend into the depths of the Deity, and that incomprehensible eternity, of which nothing is revealed to us. Therefore we do not inquire into those things which belong to the depths of the Deity, because we hold such a course to be better than to endeavour to determine that which Scripture has not determined. It clearly teaches us: God has an only-begotten Son whom He has offered for us; there is also one Holy Ghost who is uncreated, but proceeds from the Father, and is sent to us through Christ."

(6) *Schleiermacher*, Treatise on Sabellius in the Berliner Zeitschrift; Glaubenslehre, ii. § 170 ff. (s. 574 ff.). *De Wette*, Kirchliche Dogmatik, § 43 f. (s. 81 f.). *Twesten*, Dogmatik, ii. s. 179 ff. *Lücke*, in the Studien und Kritiken, 1840, 1, s. 91. On the other side, *Nitzsch*, in the Studien und Kritiken, 1841, 2.

(7) *Lessing* (Erziehung des Menschengeschlechts, § 73) had already said: "What if this doctrine (of the Trinity) should lead human reason to acknowledge that God cannot possibly be understood to be *one*, in that sense in which all finite things are *one*? that His unity must be a transcendental unity which does not exclude a kind of plurality." *Schelling*, Methode des akademischen Studiums, s. 192: "It is clear that the idea of a Trinity is absurd, unless it be considered on speculative grounds. . . . The incarnation of God is an eternal incarnation." . . . Comp. s. 184. Comp. *Blasche*, Das Böse, etc., s. 106 f. *Hegel*, Religionsphilosophie, Bd. ii. s. 230 ff.: "By God being a living spirit, we understand that He can distinguish Himself from Himself, produce Another, and in this Other remain identical with Himself. . . . This

[1] A sample of the "family caressing" in *Wackernagel*, Lehrbuch iii. (Prosa) Sp. 1058 ff.

becoming Another is the eternal absorption and yet production of Himself." S. 261: "That which first existed was the *idea* in its simple universality, the *Father*. The second is the particular, the idea in its manifestation, the *Son*. . . . The idea in its external existence; so that the external manifestation is a reflex of the first, and is known as the divine idea, the identity of the divine with the human. The third is this consciousness, God as *Spirit;* and this Spirit, as existing, is the Church."—*Daub* makes a distinction between *Deus a quo, in quo, et cui satis est Deus;* Theologum, p. 110. *Marheinecke,* Dogmatik, s. 260: "In a direct and abstract sense God is only the identity, the being which is not yet Thought, but only Spirit, *per se* (*an sich*)—the Father. In order to be this in reality, He distinguishes Himself from Himself, sets Himself as another in distinction from Himself; and in so far as He exists *for* Himself in this separate existence, He is the Son. But inasmuch as He refers Himself to Himself, and abrogates this separate existence, He is a being *existing in and for Himself* [Germ. *An und für sich seiender*], or Spirit."—On the relation of this speculative Trinity to the ecclesiastical doctrine, see *Strauss,* Dogmatik, i. s. 492; and *Weisse,* Phil. Dogmatik, § 394–481 (especially § 409). The latter, from the speculative point of view, resolves the Trinity thus: the divine Reason = the Father; the divine Heart (*Gemüth*), and the *nature-in-God* = the Son; the divine Will = the Holy Ghost. [*Delitzsch* (Bib. Psych.) would make the Will the representative of the Father, the Reason (λόγος) of the Son, the Heart of the Holy Spirit.]

(8) *Schleiermacher* and *Hase* assign to the doctrine of the Trinity the last place in their systems (Hase makes it the sum and conclusion of Christology); the adherents of Hegel, the first; the former consider it the topstone, the latter the foundation of the building. This is still further connected with their views as to the nature of religion. *Rothe* is most nearly right when he designates the Trinitarian idea of God, as set forth in Christian Speculation, as entirely different from the Trinitarian idea in the Church doctrine; and he freely concedes that the Biblical terms, Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, designate wholly different relations of God from those of His immanent mode of being (Theol. Ethik, i. s. 77). Compare

among the more recent writers, *Lange*, ii. 1, s. 123 ff. *Liebner*, i. s. 67 ff. (criticizing the latest discussion). *Martensen*, s. 95 ff. *Ebrard*, i. s. 141 ff. *Peip*, in *Herzog's* Realenc. xvi. s. 437 ff., and especially s. 454 ff. (Present Position of Dogma).

§ 296.

Creation and Preservation of the World. Providence. Theodicy.

After the followers of the Wolfian philosophy, and the like, had in vain endeavoured to reconcile the Mosaic account of the creation with the results and hypotheses of their natural philosophy and metaphysics (1), *Herder*, by his genial interpretation of the "most ancient record of mankind," rescued this story from their hands, and brought it back to the sphere of sacred poetry, recognizing its internal truthfulness (2). Since that time only a few writers have defended its literal meaning (3). The definitions concerning the *idea of creation itself*, and the cognate ideas of *preservation*, *providence*, and the *government of the world*, are closely connected with the systems of *Deism*, *Theism*, *and Pantheism* (4) (comp. § 293). The so-called Theodicy (*i.e.* the comprehension and explanation of the existence of evil in the world) (5) is also connected with these fundamental views, and at the same time passes over into the doctrines respecting demonology and anthropology (see below).

(1) Comp. the views entertained by *Michaelis* and others, in the work of *Herder* (comp. note 2); for further particulars, see *Bretschneider*, Entwicklung, s. 450 ff. *Silberschlag*, Geogonie, oder Erklärung der mosaischen Schöpfungsgeschichte, Berlin 1780–1783, 3 vols. 4to.—New attempts to save the record from the standpoint of the natural sciences, by *Buckland*, *Wagner*, *Pfaff*, *Fabri*, and others. [*Hugh Miller*, *John Pye Smith*, *Lyell*, President *Hitchcock*; see "Aids to Faith."] Comp. *Ebrard*, Die Weltanschauung der Bibel und die Naturwissen-

schaft, in the "Zukunft der Kirche," Jahrg. 1847. *Keil*, Die biblische Schöpfungsgeschichte und die geologische Erdbildungstheorien in Theol. Zeitschrift, 1860.

(2) *Herder* in his work, Die älteste Urkunde des Menschengeschlechts, eine nach Jahrhunderten enthüllte heilige Schrift, 1774 ff. (comp. the review in the Allgemeine deutsche Bibliothek, xxv. s. 24, xxx. s. 53); Ideen zur Philosophie der Geschichte der Menschheit, Bd. ii. s. 303 ff.; Geist der hebräischen Poesie, i. s. 46 ff.

(3) Comp. *Bretschneider*, s. 451. Supernaturalists also, as *Reinhard* (s. 167 ff.) and others, conceded something to modern criticism. In more recent times, however, the theory of six periods (instead of days) has had earnest advocates. The whole subject of the reconciliation of the letter of Scripture with the more recent investigations of science (geology) is connected with the idea of the authority and inspiration of the Scriptures, and must be discussed in connection with those subjects. The *dogma* of creation is only partially affected by this controversy.

(4) The idea of *a creation out of nothing* is founded on theistic views of the world. These views are deistic when the creation and preservation of the world are too much separated from each other, and the connection existing between them is destroyed; they become pantheistic when creation appears as a mere element in preservation. Comp. the passages from the works of *Fichte*, *Hegel*, and *Marheinecke*, collected by *Hase*, s. 179; and *Schleiermacher*, Christlicher Glaube, i. § 40; and *Weisse*, Phil. Dogmatik, § 538–556. Further, the idea of *providence* is theistic, and intimately connected with the idea of a supramundane personal God; it is wanting in the schemes of deism and pantheism, which run into fatalism on the one side or the other.

(5) *C. H. Blasche*, Das Böse im Einklange mit der Weltordnung dargestellt, Leipz. 1827. He has revived the earlier notion, that evil is necessary in order to form a contrast with good, etc. So, too, with the adherents of the latest school. Among the more recent, see *Rothe*, ii. s. 170; *Martensen*, s. 107 ff. *Ebrard*, i. s. 201 ff.; and the Art. "Theodicee," by *Ulrici*, in *Herzog's* Realenc. xv. s. 707; *Young*, Evil and God: a Mystery, 2d ed., Lond. 1861.

§ 297.

Angels and Devils.

The belief in the existence and agency of angels had become strange to the prosaic age, and supernaturalists themselves, who, on the authority of Scripture, continued to believe in their existence, knew not what to do with them (1). On the other hand, the enthusiast *Swedenborg* looked only the more boldly into the angelic world, but most arbitrarily substituted the notion of glorified men for the scriptural idea of angels, and denied the personal existence of the devil (2). The devil was the chief object of derision with the advocates of what were called the enlightened views of the age. *Semler* explained (after the example of *Bekker*) the demoniacal possessions by a reference to empirical psychology (3); and even those supernaturalists who, on exegetical grounds, believed in the reality of the demoniacal possessions recorded in the New Testament, were far from asserting their possibility in our times (4). In the present century, however, the belief in demoniacal possessions of the body, which had continued to obtain among the lower orders of the people, notwithstanding the progress of rationalism, was revived among the educated classes of Protestants themselves, for the most part in connection with the phenomena of animal magnetism and clairvoyance (5). The doctrine concerning the devil, too, assumed a new dogmatic significancy. *Schleiermacher* vindicated its poetic rights in regard to sacred poetry (6); while *Daub* endeavoured to assign a kind of personal existence to the author of evil; the latter, however, introduced some Manichæan elements into this doctrine (7). Most of our theologians are now of opinion that, where the doctrine concerning sin is rightly understood, the belief in the metaphysical existence of the devil is of subordinate importance; inasmuch as, according to the strictness of Scripture, he belongs at any rate to the

order of finite beings, over whose temptations (however they may show themselves) the Christian man must have the victory (8).—The doctrine respecting *angels* has also again come to honour among the latest writers on systematic theology, by some considered rather in a philosophic and idealizing sense (9), by others simply referred to the statements of Scripture (10).

(1) Thus *e.g. Reinhard*, s. 176 ff. He does not venture to decide which office they have in the present time (s. 191). *Storr*, § 49 (quoted by *Hase*, Dogmatik, s. 237).

(2) Divine Revelation, i. s. 87: "Men are constantly surrounded by spirits and angels of God, who understand everything spiritually, because they are spiritual. After death, too, men are instructed by angels," s. 102; comp. ii. s. 102, 126, 178, 226. In many places Swedenborg relates his conversations with angels, who, in his opinion, are human beings. Angels breathe as well as men, and their hearts beat; they breathe according to the measure of divine wisdom which they receive from the Lord; their hearts beat according to the measure of divine love which they receive from the Lord (s. 112, comp. s. 220). Angels and spirits also are men; for all the good and true which proceeds from man is human in its form; but the Lord is the divinely-Good and the divinely-True itself, hence He is man Himself, from whom every man is man (ii. s. 112). Because angels are angels on account of the degree of love and wisdom which they possess, and the same is the case with men, it is evident that, on account of the good connected with the true, angels are angels of heaven, and men are men of the Church (s. 157). The wisdom of angels consists in the power to see and to apprehend what they think (s. 213). All that takes place in the spiritual world is correspondence; for it is in correspondence with the inclinations of angels and spirits (s. 250).—In opposition to the doctrine of the Church, that the angels were first created, and that the devil is a fallen angel, Swedenborg teaches (s. 180) that he was instructed from the mouth of the angels themselves that in the whole heaven there is not one single angel who was created at first,

and in the whole of hell no devil who was created as an angel of light, etc., but that *all angels*, both in heaven and in hell, *derive their origin from the human race*. Hell and devils are one and the same, and so angels and heaven are one and the same; comp. s. 303. That which is in man, his spirit, is according to its true nature an angel (s. 287), and therefore man is created to become an angel (s. 289). In some places Swedenborg understands the scriptural term *angel* in a symbolical sense (comp. Bd. ii. s. 6, 16, 18, 52, 307).

(3) De Dæmoniacis, 1760 (4th ed. 1779).—Versuch einer biblischen Dämonologie, Halle 1776.

(4) *Reinhard* (s. 195 ff., 206) speaks only of those diseases which the devil is said to have caused in the times of Christ and His apostles. Comp. s. 211. "We admit such bodily possessions in the gospel history *only* on the testimony of Jesus and His apostles. As long as such an authentic testimony is wanting in modern times, no man is justified in maintaining that a diseased man is truly possessed with a devil." Comp. *Storr*, § 52 (quoted by *Hase*, s. 238).

(5) The exorcisms practised by *Gassner* in the Roman Catholic Church (from the year 1773). See *Walch*, Neueste Religionsgeschichte, Bd. vi. s. 371, s. 541 ff.—*Justinus Kerner* in the Protestant Church: Seherin von Prevorst, Stuttg. 1832, 2 vols.; Ueber das Besessensein, Heilbr. 1833. Geschichte Besessener neuerer Zeit, nebst Reflexionen, von *Eschenmayer*, Karlsruhe 1836.

(6) Glaubenslehre, i. § 44 and 45 (s. 243).

(7) Judas Ischariot, oder das Böse im Verhältnisse zum Guten betrachtet, two parts in three sections, Heidelb. 1816–1819. Comp. *Kant*, Religion innerhalb der Grenzen der blossen Vernunft, s. 99 ff. More recently, *Martensen* has endeavoured to prove the existence of the devil on Biblical and speculative grounds; Dogmatik, s. 170 ff. *Lücke*, in reply, in the Zeitschrift f. Christl. Wissenschaft, Feb. 1851. *Ebrard* (i. s. 292) shows the difference between the Biblical representations and the later perversions. See also *Lange*, ii. s. 559 ff. [*Whately*, Scriptural Doctrine of Good and Evil Spirits, Lond. 1851.]

(8) *Kant*, l.c. s. 66. **Schleiermacher*, l.c. *Twesten*, Dogmatik, ii. s. 331 ff. Comp. s. 358–360. *Mallet*, in the

art. "Teufel," in *Herzog's* Realenc. xv. s. 580 ff.: "*We hold that the personality of the devil does not belong essentially to the sphere of Christian theology, but rather to that of Christian symbolism, so that it should maintain its place both in preaching and in Christian poetry. We must lament the violence with which people have so often discussed a subject which has so little right to be regarded as a fundamental doctrine of the Christian faith; and equally, on the one side, the harsh dogmatism which denounces every doubt as to the personality of the devil as a heresy; and, on the other, the thoughtlessness of rationalism, which has nothing but derision for the notion.*" On the most recent discussions of the subject, comp. *Eltester*, "Der Streit über den Teufel," Prol. Kz. Jahrg. 1861, Nos. 32 and 33.

(9) *Martensen*, Dogmatik, s. 119, conceives of the Angel-world as the "world of ideas;" but "not ideas as they stand before abstract thought, but ideas viewed as living powers, acting spirits." The notion of personality he considers as changeable. "From the storm-wind that executes the orders of the Lord, to the seraph that stands before His throne, there is a manifold variety of angelic beings," and "no speculation will ever be in a condition to decide how far there may be powers in creation having such spirituality that with personal consciousness they may serve or resist the Creator."—*Lange* sees in the angels the spirits of the primeval world, ii. 1, s. 578 ff.—*Weisse* (Phil. Dogmatik) tries, in respect to the angels, to "*steer clear of the Scylla of dogmatic superstition, as well as the Charybdis of materialistic unbelief;*" and he does this by recurrence to Jakob Böhm's idea of "*nature-spirits*" and "*fountain-spirits*," and bringing them into connection with the attribute of the glory of God.

(10) *Ebrard*, Dogmatik, i. s. 276 ff.

THIRD DIVISION.

ANTHROPOLOGY. CHRISTOLOGY. SOTERIOLOGY, AND THE ECONOMY OF SALVATION.

§ 298.

The Doctrines concerning Man, Sin, and Liberty.

We should expect, as a matter of course, that in an age in which philosophical and theological works were full of "*philanthropy* and *humanity*," much would be said concerning the nature, dignity, and destination of man (1). In opposition to Augustine's views, the excellence of human nature was extolled, and (after the example of Rousseau) many indulged in fanciful representations of the ideal state of man (2). While freethinking theologians struck out the doctrine of original sin from their systems (3), *Kant*, on the contrary, himself pointed out the radical evil in man, but did not understand by it original sin in the ecclesiastical sense (4). The adherents of the later speculative philosophy were also far from believing that the natural state of man was the normal one; they admitted that he had fallen from his original state, that a reconciliation had become necessary, and attached little importance to the Pelagian idea of liberty, upon which the rationalists had laid great stress. But a closer examination of their theory showed that this kind of original sin was identical with the finite character of human nature and human consciousness, and was a mere matter of natural necessity; so that the idea of sin and responsibility

was destroyed, and a doctrine introduced which would prove fatal to the ethical standpoint, which rationalism had maintained in the interests of practical morality (5). In opposition to both of these tendencies (the rationalistic as well as the speculative), the Pietists, and those theologians who inclined to the old faith of the Church, revived the doctrine of Augustine in its essential points (6), to which the followers of *Schleiermacher*, and those of like tendencies, also adhered, though with considerable modifications (7). On the other hand, the idealistic glorification of man, which represented him as God awakening to consciousness, was pressed with all its energy by the left side of the *Hegelian school;* and, of course, sin was regarded as only a vanishing factor (8). But thus it became only the more apparent that at present the regeneration of the Church and of theology are chiefly to be expected from a serious and profound understanding of the doctrine of sin (9).

(1) It is worthy of notice that physical and psychological anthropology, which had formerly been treated in connection with systematic theology, was now separated from it. *Man* was made the subject of philosophical treatises written in a popular style. See *Pope*, Essay on Man, 1733. *Spalding*, Bestimmung des Menschen, Lpz. 1748. *J. J. Zollikofer*, Predigten über die Würde des Menschen, Lpz. 1783. *J. Ith*, Anthropologie oder Philosophie des Menschen, Bd. i., Winterthur 1803. (For further particulars, see *Bretschneider*, Entwurf, s. 493 ff.)—*Herder* has most ably represented the bright side of man, that is, his purely human aspect.

(2) Comp. § 275. The modern system of education was, in particular, founded on the doctrine of the excellency of human nature. Comp. *Campe*, Theophron, 1806, s. 234 ff.

(3) *Steinbart* (in the 5th section of his System der reinen Philosophie). *Henke*, Lineamenta, lxxxi.: Cavendum est, ne hanc peccandi facultatem, hunc vitiorum fomitem cum ipsis vitiis, ignis materiam cum incendio permisceamus, atque propterea totum genus humanum perditum, corruptum, propter hanc suam indolem displicere Deo, vel parvulos adeo recens in

lucem editos indignationi divinæ obnoxios esse dicamus, *quod ne de catulis quidem sanus quisquam ausit dicere*, etc. Quæ omnia (he then continues, p. lxxxiv.) ambiguitatis et erroris plena commenta sunt, pro lubitu arrepta, et præter sanæ rationis ac scripturæ sacræ assensum.

(4) Vom radicalen Bösen in der menschlichen Natur (Berliner Monatsschrift, April 1792); Religion innerhalb der Grenzen der blossen Vernunft, etc. (against the fancies [Schwärmereien] of pedagogues, s. 4 f.). The natural tendency to evil manifests itself in three different ways: 1. As frailty (fragilitas); 2. As impurity (impuritas, improbitas); 3. As malice and perversity (vitiositas, pravitas, perversitas). The proposition: Man is evil, means that he is conscious of the moral law, but he thinks it consistent with his principles of action occasionally to deviate from it. The proposition: He is *by nature* wicked, means he is wicked as belonging to the *genus humanum*. (Vitiis nemo sine nascitur, Horat.) This tendency (to evil) has not its origin in the sensuality of man, but in his liberty, hence he is responsible for it. There are also different degrees of innate guilt (reatus). The culpa corresponds to frailty and impurity; the dolus (dolus malus) corresponds to malice.—Nevertheless, Kant maintains (s. 37) that of all theories respecting the propagation of this radical evil, that is the *most incorrect* which represents us as having inherited it from our first parents; for what the poet says in reference to good may also be applied to moral evil: Genus et proavos, *et quæ non fecimus ipsi*, vix ea nostra puto.—In his opinion the narrative of Adam's fall is only a symbol, which he explains according to his principles of moral interpretation (s. 40–44). Therefore the doctrine of innate evil is not of importance for moral *theology*, but only for moral *discipline* (s. 55). On this account Kant's theory of original evil does not lead to the doctrine of redemption (in its ecclesiastical sense), but he comes to the conclusion: "That which man, considered from the moral point of view, *is* or *is to be*, whether good or evil, *he must make himself*" (s. 45). Comp. also § 301, on the economy of salvation. *Herder* therefore said: "Nobody knows how this original evil entered into human nature, nor how it may escape from it." (Von Religion, Lehrmeinungen,

und Gebräuchen, s. 204 f.) For the further development of Kant's theory, see *Tieftrunk*, Censur, iii. s. 112 ff. The later rationalists were satisfied with regarding evil as something which experience proves to exist among men, without tracing its origin to the first sin; nor did they deny that those who aspire after higher moral perfection may rise above sin. *Wegscheider*, § 118. See also *Paul*, Kant's Lehre vom radicalen Bösen, 1865.

(5) *Schelling*, Methode des akademischen Studiums, s. 176. The new (Christian) world commences with a general fall, a breaking away of man from nature. The surrender to nature itself does not constitute sin, for as long as it is not conscious of the opposite, this forms rather the golden age. The consciousness of this surrender destroys innocence, and therefore demands reconciliation and voluntary submission, in which liberty comes off both conquered and a conqueror. This is more clearly developed by *Blasche*, l.c. s. 224: "Original sin did not propagate itself, because our first parents accidentally sinned, and all other men are their descendants, but because the first conscious life of man, and the continuance and growth of this consciousness, are an original act of sin. The propagation of sin does not take place so much by *physical* as by *psychical* generation, by which we understand education,[1] on which the development of man's consciousness, in a social point of view, depends. The biblical narrative of the fall is an allegorical representation of the development of this conciousness on the part of our first parents. Their condition antecedent to this event, the life in paradise, the state of innocence, was (like the state of earliest infancy in general) an unconscious life of instinct; for all mental development can only begin with consciousness. From this it is evident, that as, in the physical creation, it is not good, but evil,[2] which is first or primary, the same must be the case in the higher spiritual creation (culture), which commences with consciousness. In the world of spirits good must first come

[1] "Education must necessarily first lead *man astray*, in his course towards spirituality, before it can lead him to virtue" (!).

[2] The word "sin" is here used in such a sense, that it may be applied even to *physical* diseases. *Kieser* in *Blasche*, ubi supra. (But where all is sin, sin has lost its significance.)

into existence, and is based upon evil." (Comp. the theory of the Ophites, vol. i. § 62.)—*Hegel* defined original sin as the natural state (das natürliche Ansichsein) of man, so far as he is conscious of it. (Philosophie der Religion, Bd. i. s. 194 ff., ii. s. 208 ff.) *Strauss*, Dogmatik, ii. s. 69–74.

(6) The Pietists and Methodists laid great stress upon the consciousness of sin (comp. § 277 and 278). In the Idea Fidei Fratrum, § 50 ff., the doctrine of the deep natural corruption of mankind is treated of very seriously, yet not without suggestion of hope.—Concerning *Oetinger's* views of the nature of evil, see *Dorner*, Christologie, s. 310 f.—*Swedenborg* departed from the Church doctrine, inasmuch as he did not believe in original sin, properly speaking, but represented man as a free agent, who is placed between heaven and earth, and exposed to the influence of good and evil spirits. But still man derives from God all the good which he possesses. Comp. his Divine Revelation, ii. s. 147 ff.; Heaven and Hell, Nr. 589–596 and 597–603.—Among modern theologians, *Tholuck* first gave a more orthodox definition of sin in his work: Die Lehre von der Sünde und vom Versöhner, oder die wahre Weihe des Zweiflers, Hamb. 1823, 9th ed. 1870. Comp. *Steudel*, *Korn*, and *Klaiber* (in *Bretschneider*, s. 530).

(7) These modifications chiefly consist in a renunciation of the strictly historical interpretation of the fall, which is also abandoned by *Tholuck* (Die Lehre von der Sünde, etc., Append. 3 [1]), and the want of more precise definitions concerning the justitia originalis. Respecting the latter, *Schleiermacher* (Christliche Glaubenslehre, i. § 75) gives it as his opinion that the idea of justitia originalis cannot be demonstrated dialectically. On the other hand, he maintains the original depravity, and entire inability of every man to perform virtuous actions; this inability ceases only in connection with the work of redemption. *De Wette* asserted that the representations of (orthodox) Protestant writers were founded upon exaggerated views, but still defended them in opposition to the superficial theories of the rationalists; see Dogmatik, § 56. Comp. *Hase*, Dogmatik, s. 102 f.

[1] *Reinhard* advocated the historical reality of the fall, but thought the forbidden fruit *poisonous*, on which account it caused the death of our first parents (!). Dogmatik (3d ed.), s. 273.

(8) *Feuerbach,* Wesen des Christenthums, s. 49: "The incarnate God is only the manifestation of man become God, which, in fact, lies in the background of the religious consciousness; for the elevation of man to God necessarily precedes the condescension of God to man. Man was already *in God,* was *God Himself, before God became man.* How otherwise could God become man? Ex nihilo nil fit."

(9) *Tholuck,* Die Lehre von der Sünde und vom Versöhner, 7th ed., Hamb. 1851. **Julius Müller,* Die christliche Lehre von der Sünde, Breslau 1839, 2 vols. 3d ed. 1849. [Transl. by *Urwick,* Edin.] Comp. with it, *G. Ritter,* Ueber das Böse, etc. (Theologische Mitarbeiten, ii. 4), Breslau 1829. *Rothe,* Ethik, ii. s. 170 ff. (partly against *Müller*). [*Rothe* places the essence of sin more in the physical constitution.] *Martensen,* s. 144 ff. Comp. *Schenkel,* Gespräche über Protestantismus und Katholicismus, Heidelb. 1852, s. 128 ff. *Dörtenbach,* art. "Sünde," in *Herzog's* Realenc. xv. s. 207 ff.

The dogma of the *Immaculate Conception of Mary* has also been awakened from the slumber in which it seemed to have sunk, and brought to a definitive decision by the Papal Bull of Dec. 8, 1854, yet not without serious objections and opposition from Catholic quarters; see the Brief of Pope Pius IX., Feb. 2, 1849, and the answer of the Prussian bishops, in *Gelzers* Protest. Monatsblätter, ix. 2, s. 69 sq. The papal decision was prepared for, dogmatically, in particular by the works of *Perrone,* De immacul. B. Virg. Mariæ Conceptu, and of *Passaglia* (§ 178). †*Denzinger,* Lehre d. unbefleckten Empfängniss, Würzburg 1855. Protestant polemics were also aroused by the new dogma; see *Julius Müller* (§ 178), and *G. A. Wimmer,* Ehrenrettung der seligen Jungfrau Maria gegen die päpstlichen Verunglimpfungen, Bremen 1855.

§ 299.

Christology.

Dorner, Ueber die Entwicklungsgeschichte der Christologie, besonders in neuern Zeiten (Tüb. Zeitschrift, 1835, 4, s. 81 ff.). *The same,* Entwicklungsgeschichte der Lehre von der Person Christi, s. 250 ff. [Eng. trans. in For. Th. Lib.] *Liebner,* Christologie, oder die christologische Einheit des dogmatischen Systems (1st ed.) (1st Part of his Dogmatik), Gött. 1849. *Thomasius,* Christi Person und Werk, Erlangen 1853–1861, 3 vols. *W. F. Gess,* Die Lehre von d. Person Christi, Basel 1856, and later edd. [*H. P. Liddon,* Divinity of Jesus Christ, Bampton Lecture for 1866, Lond. 1867.]

The more the doctrine of the natural depravity of mankind was depreciated, and the nature of man elevated, the more did the specific difference between Jesus of Nazareth and the rest of mankind disappear. Thus Socinianism and Ebionitism were reintroduced into the Church along with the Pelagianism of the so-called period of illumination (1). But there was still a deep interest in considering the human nature of Christ, *i.e.* His character as an historical person, which was represented sometimes in higher, sometimes in more trivial aspects, by different writers (2). This led to a new historical estimate of His life (3), which was best adapted to prepare the way for the revival of a belief in His higher nature, as transcending the ordinary mass of humanity. The views of *Kant* had given rise to an arbitrary distinction, unknown to the doctrine of the Church, between an ideal and an historical Christ (4). Only a small number of pious men (among whom were the most distinguished intellects of the century) retained the doctrine of the Godhead of Christ, with all the ardour of enthusiastic love, amidst a gainsaying generation (5). Some, *e.g. Immanuel Swedenborg* (6), even went so far as to adopt notions bordering on enthusiasm and heresy. The Christian rationalists declared their belief in the human historical personality of Jesus, founded upon the critical interpretation of the accounts given by the evangelists (especially in the synoptical Gospels). They differed most distinctly from the unchristian naturalism, in admitting that the founder of the Christian Church must have been possessed of the highest moral perfection, without directly asserting the dogma of the absolute sinlessness of Christ. The better class of the rationalists did not deny that Christ possessed miraculous and mysterious powers with the view of detracting from His honour, but in order to render Him more accessible to men, to make His doctrine more intelligible, and His example more fruitful (7). On the other hand, the adherents of the speculative philosophy exerted themselves to the utmost in the

defence of the *idea* of an incarnate God (which had been rejected by the rationalists), or of the unity of the divine with the human; and they thus exposed themselves to the danger of renouncing the historical manifestation of Christ, or even of converting His history into mere myths (8). Later theologians, since *Schleiermacher*, have considered it their task to show that the divine and the human in Christ (the ideal and the historical) are most intimately connected with each other. Though they widely differ from each other in reference to particular points, as well as in the modes of argumentation which they employ (9), they all agree in admitting that the received ecclesiastical terms of *person* and *nature* no longer suffice to express the real relation (10). It is also now generally acknowledged, that only a more profound philosophical and historical investigation can justify to thinking minds the idea of the God-man, or prove, with the highest degree of historical certainty, that this idea is realized in the person of Jesus of Nazareth (11).

(1) *Dorner*, Christologie, s. 255.

(2) The phrase, "*Jesus of Nazareth was a mere man*," may be very differently interpreted; there are many grades between an impostor and an enthusiast, between the latter and an extraordinary messenger of God, a prophet, a worker of miracles, and, lastly, the Son of man, after His resurrection, raised to the heavens. The teaching respecting Jesus has gone through all these grades (in an inverse order), from Socinianism down to the "Wolfenbüttel Fragments," and the "Natürliche Geschichte des Propheten von Nazareth," Bethlehem [Kopenhagen] 1800, and so on to Renan and Strauss.

(3) Bringing the person of Christ into the sphere of history, and the endeavour to understand Him like every other man in historical relations, could only in the end be subservient to the advancement of truth (hence the *Life of Jesus* is now more frequently described); for the ecclesiastical doctrine of the *true humanity* of the Redeemer must lose its significance without what may be called the *human* treatment of His history. In this respect *Herder* has distinguished himself above all other

writers. Comp. his "Christliche Schriften," and the passages quoted in his Dogmatik, § 134 ff., 190 ff., 212 ff. And yet, while emphasizing what Christ has in common with the race, he has overlooked what raises Him above it, as the unique One (Der Einzige).

(4) In connection with his doctrine of original evil, *Kant* maintained the necessity of a restoration of man by means of his freedom. To attain to this end, man stands in need of an ideal, and in fact of a human ideal; and to this need responds the scriptural doctrine concerning Christ, addressed to man's practical faith (the personified idea of the good principle). The idea has its seat in our reason; for the practical purposes of an example, etc., a character is sufficient which approaches the idea as nearly as possible. It is not necessary to suppose a supernatural generation, though it cannot be absolutely denied that such may take place; see Religion innerhalb der Grenzen der blossen Vernunft, s. 67 ff., and comp. s. 183, and *Dorner*, l.c. s. 258 ff. "*The incongruence between the historical and the ideal Christ is here indeed only hinted at in the most forbearing manner; but in point of fact this want of correspondence between the manifestation and the idea is a fundamental point in the Kantian philosophy.*" *Strauss*, ii. s. 202.

(5) *Zinzendorf* (and the Society of the United Brethren), *Spangenberg*, Idea Fidei Fratr. § 63–84. *Bengel* (comp. *Burk*, s. 353 ff., 541), *Oetinger* (comp. Dorner, l.c. s. 305 ff.), *Haller*, *Gellert*, *J. C. Lavater*, *Hamann* (Dorner, s. 305), *Stilling*, *Claudius*, *Klopstock*, *Novalis* (Dorner, s. 323 ff.). Respecting Lavater, see the biographies by *Herbst*, *Gessner*, and others; *Hegner* (Beiträge, Lpz. 1836), s. 260 ff. "My gray hair shall not descend into the grave until I have addressed these words to some of the elect: *He is more certain than I am*" (Handbibel, 1791). "*The Godhead of Christ, this supreme power in heaven and on earth, was in all its aspects the only theme which he everywhere announced, taught in his writings, and treated at length.*" *Hegner*, s. 267. Comp. on the one hand, the remarkable letter of *Goethe* addressed to Lavater in the year 1781, s. 140 f.

(6) The Christology of *Swedenborg* bears a close resemblance to that of Swenkfeld. Jesus is born of the Holy Ghost and

Mary. Inasmuch as His divinity is the divinity of the Father, His body was also divine. That which was human in Him was made divine by sufferings and temptations. The human which He received from Mary was gradually laid aside, and the heavenly divine body put on. It is the divine body which He took with Him to heaven. (Comp. his views concerning the Trinity, above, § 295; *Dorner*, s. 208, Anm.)—On *Oetinger's* Christology, see "Theologie aus der Idee des Lebens," s. 245 ff.; *Auberlen*, s. 152, 163, 231, 239 ff., and other passages.

(7) *Röhr*, Briefe über den Rationalismus (xi.), and Christologische Predigten, Weimar 1831. *Wegscheider*, Institutiones, § 123, 128. *Paulus*, Das Leben Jesu.—*Dorner*, l.c. s. 278 f. (Rationalism knows only of a doctrina Christi, not of a doctrina de Christo.)—On the controversy respecting the adoration of Christ, which was carried on in Magdeburg in the year 1840, see *Hase*, Kg. § 466.

(8) On the origin of these speculative views of Christ's nature as traced to the works of Spinoza, see *Strauss*, ii. s. 199.—*Fichte* (Anweisung zum seligen Leben, s. 166 ff.) makes a distinction between the absolute and the empirical point of view. From the absolute point of view, the eternal Word becomes, at all times, and in every one, flesh, in the same manner in which It became flesh in Jesus Christ, and manifests Itself to every man who has a clear view of his unity with God. Fichte, indeed, admits that the knowledge of the absolute unity of the human existence with the divine (the deepest knowledge to which man can attain) had not existed before the time of Jesus; but he also imagines that the philosopher may not only discover these truths independently of Christianity, but also take a more comprehensive and clearer view of them than has been transmitted by Christianity. On the one hand, he professes to believe (s. 172) that all truly rational men will, to the end of time, render profound homage to this Jesus of Nazareth, and acknowledge the incomparable excellency of this highly exalted person with the greater humility the more they know themselves; though he also thinks (s. 173) that if Jesus were to return to our world, He would be satisfied at finding Christianity established in the minds of men, without claiming adoration for

Himself. But, on the other hand (s. 173), he maintains that it is the *metaphysical* alone, and not the *historical*, which will save a man (the latter only makes the thing intelligible). "If any one be truly united with God, it is *altogether indifferent* in what manner he has attained to this state, and it would be a most useless and perverse occupation to waste much time in the recollection of the manner, instead of enjoying that union itself."—*Schelling*, Methode des akademischen Studiums, s. 175: "The highest sense of religion which expressed itself in Christian mysticism, regarded the mystery of *nature* and that of *the incarnation of God* as one and the same." Ibid. s. 192: "Theologians interpret the incarnation of God in Christ empirically, as if God assumed the nature of man at a definite moment of time. But it is impossible to attach any meaning to this idea, since God is eternally external to all time. Hence the incarnation of God is an *incarnation from eternity*. The man Christ forms in His historical appearance only the crown, and therefore also the beginning of that incarnation; for beginning with Him, it was so to be continued, that all His followers should be members of one and the same body of which He is the head. History testifies that God became truly objective *first* in Christ: for who that preceded Him revealed the infinite in such a manner?" On the other hand, comp. s. 194 f., where he maintains that the numerous incarnations in which the natives of India believe are more rational than the single incarnation of God taught by Christian missionaries; and s. 206: "Whether the writings of the New Testament are genuine or not, whether the narratives contained in them are real and unadulterated facts, and whether their contents are in accordance with the idea of Christianity or not, cannot affect the reality of that idea, inasmuch as it does not depend on *this single phenomenon*, but is universal and absolute." For further particulars, comp. *Dorner*, s. 339 ff.—*Blasche* (Ueber das Böse, s. 300) regards the matter more from the historical point of view: . . . "Christ is the representative of the acme to which the world-historical work of redemption had attained. The incarnation of God was completed in Him. He has therefore the significance of a *personal moral Creator of the world*" (s. 301). "He was the highest product of the universal moral

creation in the history of the world; this higher creation became personal particularly in Him" (s. 303). — Concerning the christological views of *Hegel* (Philosophie der Relig., Bd. ii. s. 204 ff., especially s. 233–256), see *Dorner*, l.c. s. 397 ff., and his remarks respecting them, s. 406 ff. According to Dorner, it is difficult to decide whether the historical Christ (in the system of Hegel) possesses any specific dignity,[1] or whether Hegel does not believe in the unity of the divine with the human *in Christ*, merely as a means of comprehending it *in himself*. (*Dorner*, s. 414.) The adherents of the two schools of Hegel in this respect differ in their Christology. Some (as *Marheinecke*, *Rosenkranz*, and *Conradi*, see *Dorner*, s. 366 ff.) endeavour to unite the *historical Christ* with the *ideal*. Others do not consider Him as a purely mythical person, but as the accidental representative of a certain idea; this idea gave rise to the development of a body of myths, which were thrown around the name and person of Jesus. Thus *Strauss*, in his Leben Jesu, and in his Dogmatik, ii. s. 209 ff.[2]

(9) *De Wette* (comp. *Dorner*, s. 281 ff., who classes him with Fichte and Jacobi; but he ought rather to be compared with *Herder*) is not to be confounded with those who, rejecting the historical, attach importance only to the idea. On the contrary, he regards the *historical Christ* as the realized idea; although, it must be confessed, his eye is rather turned toward the aspiring, subjective heart, seeking what may satisfy its wants, than to the investigating and argumentative intellect. He combats the mythico-speculative theory in

[1] *Hegel* rejected the rationalistic theory, s. 240: "If we regard Christ in the same light as Socrates, we regard Him as a mere man, like the Mahometans, who consider Christ to have been an ambassador from God, as all great men may generally be called ambassadors or messengers of God. If we say no more of Christ than that He was a teacher of mankind, and a martyr for truth, we express ourselves neither from the Christian point of view, nor from that of true religion."—But compare what follows.

[2] However much *Jacobi* differed from the speculative philosophers (on theological points), he was equally indifferent as to the historical person of the Redeemer, and rested satisfied with subjective religious feelings, while they contented themselves with the speculative idea. See the words addressed to Claudius in the introduction to this treatise: Von den göttlichen Dingen (reprinted in *Strauss*, Dogmatik, ii. s. 203). In this *Herder* forms a partial contrast with *Jacobi*, or rather a necessary complement to him (as Jacobi writes to Claudius, so does *Goethe* to Lavater, only in stronger terms; see note 5).

decided terms; Religion und Theologie, s. 184. He was also the first who again treated Christian ethics (which orthodox theologians had been accustomed to discuss in the most abstract manner) on the foundation of the *person of Christ;* comp. his Lehrbuch der christlichen Sittenlehre, § 41 ff., § 53 ff. See also his Vorlesungen über die Religion, Vorlesung 18: "All the rays of truth which had broken forth among men flow together in Christ, the light of the world. All the knowledge of the true and the good previous to His time is only the presentiment of that which He has revealed." Ibid. s. 444: "The *personality of Jesus,* His life and death, and faith in Him, constitute the *centre of Christianity.* The spirit of religion became personal in Him, and, proceeding from Him, exerted an influence upon the world which stood in need of a new religious life in order to regenerate it." Comp. his Kirchliche Dogmatik, § 66; Religion und Theologie, s. 115 ff.; Vorwort zum Commentar des Matthäus; and the last chapter of his historical review of the narratives of the Gospels (on John); the two latter are written in opposition to *Strauss.*—*Schleiermacher* has treated this doctrine in a more dialectic manner, and thus "*exerted more influence than any other modern theologian upon his contemporaries.*" (*Dorner,* s. 488 ff.) But, at the same time, he has given rise to new doubts (*Strauss,* Dogmatik, ii. s. 180 ff.). Compare his Weihnachtsfeier; Der Christliche Glaube, ii. § 92–105; Reden über Religion, 1829; Sendschreiben an Lücke (Studien und Kritiken, 1829, 2 and 3); several of his sermons; and the representations of his system given by Dorner and Strauss, l.c. Schleiermacher (like De Wette) differs from the adherents of the speculative school in rejecting the notion of an *ideal* Christ apart from the *historical* Christ. The *historical* and the *ideal* (he substituted these terms for those of human and divine nature) are, in his opinion, united in Christ. The ideal does not consist in skill and dexterity in particular departments of life, but in the purity and vigour of the consciousness of God. Schleiermacher rests faith in the divine authority of Christ on the idea of His sinlessness, and in connection with it, on the impossibility of His having erred. The Church, as well as every believer, possesses the consciousness of this (an inference from the effect to the cause). Christ

came into His human existence without sin. This generation does not necessarily exclude the idea of participation on the part of man, but is still to be regarded as a supernatural event, which does not stand in connection with what is sinful, but is a new creation. In opposition to *Strauss*, who asserts that the divine love could not have been wholly expended upon one individual, *Ullmann*, *Schweizer*, and others have carried the question back to the *religious* point of view, from which alone Schleiermacher proceeded. Others have endeavoured on more speculative grounds to determine the relation of the individual to the species, and thus revived the old scholastic controversy (respecting Nominalism and Realism). —*Hase* agrees with Schleiermacher in maintaining (in opposition to the orthodox ecclesiastical, as well as the historical theory) that the divine nature of Christ consisted in His blameless piety (Dogmatik, s. 286 f.), and connects with this the thought, that, after the example of Christ, every son of man, as far as is possible for him, ought to develope himself as a son of God, and every man to a God-man. Comp. *Dorner*, s. 289 ff.

(10) The old doctrine of the Church has again found defenders in modern times under various modifications: *Steffens*, Von der falschen Theologie, s. 127. *Sartorius*, Die Lehre von Christi Person und Werk, Hamb. 1831, 1834.— *Schleiermacher* limited the specific difference between Christ and other men to His sinlessness—an idea brought out into the sharpest light by *Ullmann* (Sündlosigkeit Jesu, Hamb., 5te Aufl. 1846). In contrast with this preponderance of the anthropological method of constructing the person of Christ, the metaphysical and theological method has been revived and enforced in the interest of the orthodox doctrine of the Church. Besides *Dorner*, see in particular *Liebners* Christolog. 1849, s. 12 ff. [Liebner's view is that of the necessity of the incarnation—presupposing creation as a free act—as the essential basis of Christianity, and the clue to all its mysteries.] See also *Ebrard*, Die Gottmenschlichkeit des Christenthums, Zürich 1844; and his Dogmatik, ii. s. 1 ff. *Lange*, Dogmatik, ii. 1, s. 399 ff.: "*The idea of the God-man is the concentration of all knowledge of the divine in the human, and of the human in the divine, consequently the source of a truly divine,*

human life, hence it is the really fundamental idea of life." See also *Rothe*, Ethik, ii. 1, s. 279 ff. According to *Martensen*, s. 221, "it belongs to the Son to have His life not merely in the Father, but also in the world." "As the heart of God the Father, He is also the eternal heart of the world;" hence the significance of His pre-existence. *W. F. Gess*, in his Lehre von der Person Christi, Basel 1856 (partly in opposition to Liebner, Thomasius, and Dorner), has made a new attempt to develope a Christology "from the self-consciousness of Christ and the testimony of the apostles." His doctrine of the κένωσις is greeted by many as a theological truth, founded in Scripture; by others it is opposed. So by *Beyschlag*, Die paulinische Christologie (Studien u. Kritiken, 1860); comp. *Bodemeyer*, Die Lehre von der Kenosis, Gött. 1860. On the Christology of *Thomasius* (Christi Person und Werk), see the Zeitschrift of *Kliefoth* and *Mejer*, iv. 2, 3. [See *R. W. Wilberforce*, Doctrine of the Incarnation in relation to Mankind and the Church, 1850.]

(11) "*In point of fact, we cannot look for a Restitutio in integrum of any one of the earlier centuries of ecclesiastical development, or even of the sixteenth century; but a higher prospect is held out to us. Nor can any new, merely sharpened one-sidedness (or even several such points) be the end* (of these christological studies), *but rather a higher unity, after the large experiences we have had in philosophy and theology.*" *Liebner*, in the Preface to his Dogm. s. x.—"*Our time has correctly declared the idea of the divine humanity to be the key to Protestant theology; its essential task must be to grasp the two antagonisms of the divine and human in Christ as abolished and reconciled, and to find the root of its theology in the unity of the divine and human natures as personally realized in Christ. That is, it is its office to grasp the historical Christ as being equally a really ideal Christ, and the ideal as also historical.*" *Schenkel*, Wesen des Protestantismus, i. s. 357 ff.

Menken (Homilien über das 9 und 10 Capitel des Briefs an die Hebräer, Bremen 1831) and *Irving* (Human Nature of Christ) revived the controversy, whether Christ assumed the human nature as it existed *before*, or as it existed *after* the fall? Menken and Irving maintained the latter. Irving was, on account of this assertion, excluded from the Scotch National Church. The subject in question also gave rise to discussions among the theologians belonging to the Evangelical school of Geneva. See *Dorner*,

Appendix, s. 530 ff. *Baur*, Versöhnungslehre, s. 664, Anm.; and *Preiswerk*, Lettre adressée à MM. les membres du Comité de la Société évangélique de Genève, 1837 (German and French); Evang. Kirchenz. xxi. s. 433 ff.

The scholastic question, how far the manifestation of Christ was conditioned by the sin of Adam (see above, § 182, note 2), has also been revived by modern theology and investigated anew. See *Julius Müller* (against *Dorner*), whether the Son of God would have become man if the human race had remained sinless, in the Deutsche Zeitschrift f. Christl. Wissenschaft, 1850, Nr. 40–42. *Flörke*, Die Menschwerdung Gottes abgesehen von der Sünde (Zeitschrift f. d. lutherische Theologie, 1854). [Archbp. *Trench* has contended for an Incarnation even without the fall.]

§ 300.

The Doctrine of Atonement.

Baur, Lehre von der Versöhnung, s. 478 ff. *Gess*, Der geschichtliche Entwicklungsgang der neutest. Versöhnungslehre (Jahrbb. f. deutsche Theol. 1857, 1858). *Ritschl*, Studien über die Begriffe von der Genugthuung und dem Verdienste Christi (Jahrbb. f. d. Theol. 1860). *Weber*, Vom Zorne Gottes, ein theolog. Versuch, Erlang. 1862. *Schöberlein*, art. "Versöhnung," in *Herzog's* Realenc. XVII. s. 143. [Comp. also the Eng. works of *Thomson*, *Macleod Campbell*, and *Oxenham*, u. s.]

As the Pietists had, during the preceding period, lowered the juridical idea of satisfaction, so the doctrine of atonement was represented by *Zinzendorf*, in its internal connection with the Christian life, as the essence of Christianity. At the same time he gave it a more sensuous aspect than it had, either in the theory of Anselm or in the theological system of the old Lutherans, but one which was implied in the phraseology of the mystics (1). On the other hand, *Conrad Dippel* and *Swedenborg* rejected, from the point of view of a free, critical mysticism, the ecclesiastical doctrine of satisfaction altogether (2). It was also attacked by rationalism. After *Töllner* had called forth a spirit of inquiry in other directions, and also by combating the received doctrine of the active obedience of Christ (in opposition to *Ch. W. F. Walch*) (3), the entire host of those who advocated the so-called enlightenment of the age opposed the Church doctrine as unprofitable and dangerous to true morality (4). Other theo-

logians undertook its defence, some holding more, others less rigid opinions concerning it (5). Here, too, *Kant* introduced a new series of discussions, by pointing out, in connection with his doctrine concerning original evil, the necessity of a restoration of human nature; but he assigned only a symbolical and moral significance to the death of Christ (6). The rationalists proper treated the subject from a more negative point of view than Kant, losing sight of the symbolical in the merely moral (7). On the other hand, *De Wette* brought the symbolical more prominently forward in peculiar aspects (8). *Schleiermacher* connected the doctrine of the vicarious sufferings and perfect obedience of Christ with His sinlessness and the doctrine of His priestly office, but separated the substitution and the satisfaction, so as to represent Christ's sufferings as only vicarious, but not as making satisfaction; and his obedience as making satisfaction, but not as vicarious (9). The adherents of the speculative school regarded the death of the God-man as the abolition of His existence in a different mode of being from His primitive state (*das Aufheben des Andersseins*), and a necessary return of the life of God, that had assumed a finite form, into the sphere of the infinite (10). Some of the strict supernaturalists, *Hasenkamp, Menken, Stier,* also found fault with the theory of Anselm, and endeavoured to substitute for it another scheme which they thought more in accordance with the doctrine of Scripture (11). But other theologians espoused the cause of Anselm, and, so far from rejecting his doctrine as useless, sought to develope it more fully in the same spirit (12).

(1) Comp. § 278. In opposition to Zinzendorf, *Bengel,* l.c. s. 81 ff., s. 89, expressed himself as follows: "The United Brethren attach almost exclusive importance to imagination, and care little about the understanding." S. 90: "Therefore they do not cease to talk of blood, wounds, the prints of the nails, the holes in His side, the smell of His corpse, etc., and frequently use the word Lamb in an indiscreet manner. . . . Such images of scourges, the cross, etc., are calculated to

produce an impression upon the natural senses and affections, especially in the case of the illiterate, but they constitute neither the whole thing nor its principal part." S. 123: "He who knows the nature of the human mind cannot approve of those who, in their thoughts and discourses, select one single article from among the whole treasure of wholesome doctrine, upon which they constantly dwell and expect others to do the same. This leads to empty, stupid talk. By means of arbitrary, forced, and exaggerated meditations about the blood of Christ, they would fain bring us back to mere nature." We should "not stir even the noblest juice unceasingly, and so make it lose its flavour." S. 124: "If any one had a watch, and should take away from it, piece by piece, the parts which he thinks may be dispensed with, because they do not point out the hour, the hand itself would soon become of no use to him. He that takes away all the parts of anything, destroys the whole. To take in pieces is to destroy." P. 126: "Many make of the blood of Christ an opiate by which they bring themselves and others into doubt as to what is right and wrong."

(2) *Dippel* agrees with the mystics in regarding the internal life of Christ as containing the redeeming principle, in opposition to those who laid principal stress upon His external sufferings. In his view, the death of Christ is a type of that death which the old man must suffer in us. Christ did not deliver us from chastisements, but taught us how to bear them, that they may serve to turn our minds from earthly things. Comp. *Walch,* Einleit. in die Religionsstreitigk. ii. s. 718 ff., v. s. 998 ff. *Baur,* l.c. s. 473 ff. Concerning the relation in which this doctrine stands to the Socinian, see also *Baur,* l.c. s. 473 ff.—According to *Swedenborg,* Christ's sufferings on the cross were the last temptation which He had to resist in order to obtain the victory over the kingdom of Satan (*i.e.* hell); His human nature was at the same time glorified by these sufferings, *i.e.* united with the divine nature of the Father. See Divine Revelation, i. s. 36 ff., and other passages.

(3) Comp. *Ch. G. F. Walch,* De Obedientia Christi activa Commentatio, Gott. 1755. *J. G. Töllner,* Der thätige Gehorsam Jesu Christi, Bresl. 1768. This treatise is to be compared with his Vermischte Aufsätze, ii. 2, s. 273, in which he defends

the orthodox doctrine of Christ's *passive* obedience and its practical utility, in opposition to Taylor and the Socinians. Comp. *Baur*, s. 478 ff. *Ernesti*, in the Neue Theol. Biblioth. Bd. ix. s. 914 ff. This is rather about than against Töllner. He also thinks that the distinction between obedientia activa et passiva, which is only calculated to produce confusion, ought long ago to have been given up; but "*people do not like to tune old instruments in a different key, lest the strings should break.*" Ernesti therefore undertakes to defend, at the sacrifice of philosophical exactitude, the assailed doctrine (s. 942). For further particulars, and the works in reply, see *Baur*, s. 504, Anm.

(4) *Steinbart, Eberhard, Bahrdt, Henke, Löffler*, and others; see *Baur*, s. 505–530.

(5) Among the advocates of the scriptural doctrine of redemption (but not of the theory of Anselm), *Herder* takes the most prominent place as regards truly spiritual views. (See his Erläuterungen zum Neuen Testament, p. 51–66, and his Von Religion und Lehrmeinungen, Abh. 7; comp. also his Dogmatik, s. 212 ff.) Herder endeavoured particularly to maintain the religious aspect of this doctrine instead of the juridical. On the contrary, several of the modern advocates of the latter theory (*Michaelis, Storr*, and partly also *Seiler*) adhered to the theory of Grotius, that the design of Christ's death was to set before us an example of punishment (comp. § 268, note 9), with which, however, they connected some other representations. Thus Storr supposed that the death of Christ exerted a reacting influence upon Himself, by elevating Him to a higher state of moral perfection (Von dem Zweck des Todes Jesu, s. 664, quoted by *Baur*, s. 544 ff.).—*Döderlein, Morus, Knapp, Schwarz*, and *Reinhard*[1] regarded the death of Jesus as a solemn confirmation on the part of God of His willingness to pardon sin. Generally speaking, these supernaturalists did not strictly adhere to the definitions of the

[1] All the various objects of Christ's death are surveyed in their connection by *Reinhard* with logical precision, § 107. He admits that this doctrine has been corrupted by numerous false additions, by which *thinking men* might be induced to regard it with suspicion; hence he does not approve of the opinion that the wrath of God against sinful men rendered such a sacrifice necessary, and was, as it were, *only appeased by the blood of Christ*. He also rejects other ideas connected with the ecclesiastical doctrine and essential to its integrity. And at last he contents himself with the view that the death of Christ was a *solemn*

symbolical books, and only admitted that which they thought could be proved by the plain words of Scripture. Nevertheless they did not wholly reject the theory of accommodation, especially as applied to God. See *Baur*, s. 547 ff.

(6) Religion innerhalb der Grenzen der blossen Vernunft, s. 87 ff. According to *Kant*, man must, after all, help himself. A substitution, in the proper sense of that word, cannot take place. It is impossible that liabilities should be transmissible like debts (s. 88). Neither does the reformation of the heart pay off former debts. Thus man would still have to expect an infinite punishment on account of the infinite guilt which he has contracted. Nevertheless the extinction of guilt is possible. For inasmuch as, in consequence of the opposition (*antinomy*) existing between moral perfection and external happiness, he who amends his conduct has to undergo the same sufferings as he who perseveres in his evil course, and the *former* bears those sufferings with a worthy intention for the sake of virtue, he willingly submits to them as the punishment due the old man for his former sins. In a physical aspect he continues the same man, but in a moral aspect he has become another man; thus the latter suffers in the room of the former. But that which thus takes places in man himself, as an internal act, is manifested in the person of Christ (the Son of God) in a visible manner, as the personified idea; that which the new man takes upon himself, while he is dying to the old man, is set forth in the Representative of mankind as a death suffered once for all (comp. s. 89 ff.). Nor can, in the opinion of Kant, any external expiation (not even that of the Son of God as our ideal representative) supply the lack of our own moral improvement (s. 96 and 163).—Concerning those theologians who adopted the principles of Kant, *Tieftrunk* (*Süsskind*), *Stäudlin*, *Ammon*, and others, see *Baur*, l.c.—The theory of Kant was modified by *Krug*, in his "Widerstreit der Vernunft mit sich selbst, in der Versöhnungs-

declaration that God will be merciful to sinners. "God thus appears as a *loving Father*, who is willing to grant pardon to sinners, but also as an *earnest and wise Father*, who, far from exhibiting any unseasonable and improper tenderness, will implant in the minds of the children whom He pardons a most vivid aversion to their former sins, and teach them by an example (Grotius) the dreadful consequences that attend the transgression of His laws and the misery which they themselves have deserved."

lehre dargestellt und aufgelöst," Züllichau 1802 (Gesammelte Schriften, 1 Abth.; Theol. Schriften, Bd. i. 1830, s. 295 ff.). See *Baur*, s. 589 ff.

(7) *Wegscheider*, p. iii. c. ii. § 142, reduces the design of Christ's death to this: Per religionis doctrinam a Christo propositam et ipsius morte sancitam hominibus, dummodo illius præceptis omni, quo par est, studio obsequantur, veram monstrari viam et rationem, qua, repudiatis quibusvis sacrificiis aliisque cæremoniis placandi numinis divina caussa institutis, vero Dei ejusque præceptorum amore ducti Deo probari possint.—*Attamen* (he continues) *ne* animis fortioribus bene consulendo *imbecilliores offendamus*, sententiam de morte Jesu Christi expiatoria, ipsorum scriptorum ss. exemplo, *etiam symbolica quadam ratione* adumbrare licebit, ita ut mors Christi proponatur vel tamquam symbolum, quo sacrificia qualiacunque sublata sint, ac reconciliatio hominis cum Deo significata et venia peccatorum cuivis vere emendato solemni ritu confirmata, etc.—He uses very strong language against the misuse of the ecclesiastical doctrine (which he caricatures): Omnino vero doctores caveant, ne conscientiæ improborum, imprimis morti propinquorum, quasi veternum obducant nimium jactando vim sanguinis Christi expiatoriam, quo Deus Molochi instar, piaculi innocentis quippe sanguinem sitientis, placatus sistatur. (Comp. *Bengel* above, note 1, and *Reinhard*, note 5.) On the rational supernaturalistic theory of *Schott* and *Bretschneider*, comp. *Baur*, s. 608 ff.

(8) In his Commentatio De Morte Christi expiatoria, Berol. 1813 (reprinted in his Opuscula, Berol. 1830). The views propounded in that treatise are completed and corrected in the later writings of *De Wette* (comp. the preface to his Opuscula).—Religion und Theologie, s. 253: "We do not think, like many modern theologians, that the doctrine of atonement is a useless or even pernicious relic of Judaism in Christianity . . . we regard it (as grasped by the feelings) as an *æsthetic religious symbol* which exerts the most beneficial influence upon the *pious mind*. The consciousness of guilt is the religious sentiment of submission, by which we humble ourselves before God, and through which we obtain peace. As all ideas have their historical and personal manifestation in Christ, so too this idea of redemption, which surpasses all

others, in order that the entire life of mankind might be reflected in Him. . . . In the death of Jesus, which is the greatest proof of His love, we see displayed both the magnitude of our depravity, and the victory over it." Comp. his Dogmatik, § 73*a*, 73*b*. The symbolical interpretation of Christ's death adopted by De Wette differs from that of Kant (and Wegscheider), in addressing itself to the *feelings* of man, and thus making the appropriation of that event a necessary act on the part of every one, inasmuch as religion itself has its root in those feelings. On the other hand, Kant regarded the death of Christ as a symbol designed to assist the *understanding* (as a needful aid for those who require a symbolical representation of abstract ideas).

(9) According to *Schleiermacher*, the redeeming and atoning principle is not the single fact that Christ died, but a vital union with Him. (In this union he recognizes a mystical element, which he distinguishes from the magical as well as the empirical, assigning to it an intermediate place.) By means of *this vital union* we appropriate to ourselves Christ's righteousness (His obedience unto death);[1] this appropriation, however, is not to be confounded with the mere external theory of vicarious satisfaction. But inasmuch as this single being represents the totality of believers, He may be rather called our *satisfaction-making substitute.* Comp. his Christlicher Glaube, ii. s. 103 ff., s. 128 ff. *Baur*, s. 614 ff. In opposition to Schleiermacher, *Steudel* defended the orthodox doctrine, see *Baur*, s. 642.—*Nitzsch*, following Schleiermacher, endeavoured (System der christlichen Lehre, s. 238–248) to assign a more definite significance to Christ's passive obedience, which, in the opinion of Schleiermacher, is only the crown of His active obedience. He made a distinction between reconciliation and expiation (καταλλαγή and ἱλασμός).

(10) *Fichte*, Anweisung zum seligen Leben, especially the fifth Lecture, s. 124 ff.; the ninth and tenth, s. 251 ff. *Baur*, s. 692 ff. *Schelling* (see Christology), Methode des akademischen Studiums, § 299, note 8. Comp. *Blasche*, Das Böse, etc., s. 304 ff. *Hegel*, Phil. der Religion, Bd. ii. s. 246 ff., s. 249: "God is dead: this is the most dreadful idea, that all

[1] Schleiermacher rejected the phrase that Christ fulfilled the *law;* He only fulfilled the *Divine will*, s. 134 f.

that is eternal, all that is true, is no more, that negation itself is in God; the highest pain, the consciousness of perfect inability to help oneself, the giving up of all that is higher, is connected with this idea. But the process does not stop here; on the contrary, a change takes place: God preserves Himself in this process, which thus becomes the *death of death*. God rises again to life, and thus turns to the opposite." .... S. 251: "It is infinite love, that God identifies Himself with that which is foreign to Him, in order to kill it. This is the import of Christ's death." S. 253: "The phrase: *God Himself is dead*, occurs in a Lutheran hymn; this means, that the human, the finite, the frail, the negative, itself contains a divine principle, is in God Himself; that the being-Another (*das Anderssein*), the finite, the negative, is not without God, does not prevent the unity with God," etc.—Comp. *Baur*, l.c. s. 712 ff., and his Christliche Gnosis, s. 671 ff.—*Daub*, Theologumena (quoted by *Baur*, s. 696 ff.): "The world cannot by itself render satisfaction to God; God alone possesses a nature which can make satisfaction, or reconcile. As God, rendering satisfaction to God, He is the Son; as He to whom satisfaction is made, the Father; but both are in themselves One; the atonement belongs to the nature of God, and is as eternal as the creation and preservation. God from eternity sacrifices Himself for the world; or, God the Father commands God the Son to sacrifice Himself to Him, and make satisfaction to Him. Accordingly, inasmuch as God making satisfaction puts Himself in place of the world, this satisfaction is vicarious, and active as well as passive. God making reconciliation elevates the world to absolute necessity, and is thus at the same time its Creator and Preserver, or the foundation of its absolute reality and liberty."—*Marheinecke*, Dogmatik, § 227–247 (quoted by *Baur*, s. 718 ff.): "By the reconciliation of the world with God through God, we understand that the Divine Being, one with Himself and with the world, makes the transition through the corruption of the world, and destroys it. God, as the Being who is from eternity self-sufficient, is also the Being who from eternity is self-satisfying. But God can make satisfaction only as God-man, in whom reconciliation is possible, inasmuch as His human nature is not essentially different from the Divine.

The satisfaction made by the God-man is vicarious, since He, in making reconciliation, represents the world. This implies a twofold statement: first, that the world, in its state of corruption, cannot make satisfaction to God; and secondly, that the world, in its truth and reality, as human nature, or in its true and holy principle, is represented by the person of the One Man who is the representative of all men, and thus the universal man, though He be but one individual."—*Usteri*, Paulin. Lehrbegriff, s. 133: "The incarnation of the Son of God, who is begotten of the original ground of all things (the Father), is the reconciliation of the finite with the infinite, of the created with the primal ground of being, of the temporal with the eternal. The incarnate Son of God, by His death, returns from the sphere of the finite, created, and temporal, to the sphere of infinity as Spirit who now reigns in the finite, and unites it eternally with God."

(11) *Klaiber* (quoted by *Baur*, s. 648), and especially *Hasenkamp* (father and son), *Menken* (pastor at Bremen), *Collenbusch* (at Bremen), and *Rudolph Stier*. All these agree in rejecting the idea of a conflict between the love and justice of God (Hasenkamp and Menken, in particular, expressed themselves in strong language on this point), and in regarding the divine love as the true principle of redemption, but differed on some minor points (*e.g.* Stier retains the idea of the divine wrath). For further particulars, see *Baur*, s. 656 ff., where the literature is also given. Comp. *Krug*, Die Lehre des Dr. Collenbusch, Elberfeld 1846, s. 44.

(12) To this class belongs the author of an essay published in the Evangelische Kirchenz. 1834; Geschichtliches aus der Versöhnungs- und Genugthuungslehre. See *Baur*, s. 672 ff., and *Göschel*, Zerstreute Blätter aus den Hand- und Hülfsacten eines Juristen, etc. The latter especially defended the juridical aspect of the doctrine in question, which had given offence to many others. Comp. *Tholuck's* literar. Anzeiger, 1833, s. 69 ff.; Evangel. Kirchenzeit. 1834, s. 14; *Baur*, s. 682 ff.—The controversy has entered into a new phase, in the Lutheran Church, in consequence of the positions taken by *J. Ch. K. v. Hofmann* of Erlangen, in his "Schriftbeweis," and in the Zeitschrift für Protest. und Kirche, March 1856, deviating from strict orthodoxy in respect to "the vicarious

satisfaction." *Philippi* replied in the preface to the second edition of his commentary to the Romans; and in the tractate, "Herr Dr. Hofmann gegenüber der lutherischen Versöhnungs- und Rechtfertigungslehre," Frankf. 1856; and *Schmid* in his "Dr. von H.'s Lehre von der Versöhnung," Nördl. 1856. In rejoinder *Hofmann*, Schutzschriften für eine neue Weise, alte Wahrheit zu lehren, Nördl. 1856. (Comp. *Ebrard* in the Allg. Kz., Oct. 1856.) Against Hofmann: *G. Thomasius*, Das Bekenntniss der lutherischen Kirche von der Versöhnung, etc., Erlangen 1857. *Delitzsch* in the Appendix to his Commentary on Epistle to Hebrews. *Hengstenberg* in the Pref. to the Evangel. Kirchztg. 1858, and others.

[In several recent English works the life-theory is advocated, in distinction from the satisfaction-theory; *e.g.* by *Maurice*, Doct. of Sacrifice, 1854; *John M'Leod Campbell*, The Nature of the Atonement, Camb. 1856. Comp. also *William Thomson*, The Atoning Work of Christ; the Bampton Lectures for 1853. *J. C. Macdonnell*, Six Discourses on Doctrine of Atonement (Univ. Dublin), 1858. *R. W. Dale*, Birmingham, On the Atonement, var. edd. *Cave*, On Doct. of Sacrifice, Edinr. 1878.]

The doctrine of a *Descensus ad inferos* was agreeable neither to the views of the rationalists nor to the modern supernaturalists. The adherents of the speculative philosophy regarded it as a mere symbolical expression, to indicate that, even in the most corrupted souls, there is still a bright point at which the gospel of Christ may enter. Compare the passages from the works of *Reinhard*, *De Wette*, *Marheinecke*, in *Hase*, Dogmatik, s. 344.—The doctrine of the three offices of Christ was combated by *Ernesti*, in his Opuscula Theologica, p. 411 ss. Modern theologians (such as *Schleiermacher*) have revived it. Comp. *König*, Die Lehre von Christi Höllenfahrt, Frankf. 1842; and especially *E. Güder*, Die Lehre von der Erscheinung Jesu Christi unter den Todten, in ihrem Zusammenhange mit der Lehre von den letzten Dingen, Bern 1853. *F. Huydekoper* (§ 69). †*J. Körber*, Katholische Lehre von der Höllenfahrt Jesu Christi, Landshut 1860.

§ 301.

The Economy of Salvation. Justification and Sanctification. (Faith and Works.) Grace and Liberty. Predestination.

The strictly ecclesiastical view of the doctrine of atonement having been abandoned, the juridical idea of justification, as

sharply separated from sanctification, necessarily lost its significance, and Protestant theologians manifested a leaning to the Roman Catholic doctrine, in regarding both as different aspects of the same divine act (1). *Kant*, notwithstanding his theory of radical evil, claimed for man the power of amending himself by his own free will (2); but he rejected, in accordance with the essential principles of Protestantism, all external and merely legal righteousness, or any merit based on the same (3). He also pointed out the importance of *faith*, but made a distinction between the statutory (historical) faith in the doctrines of the Church, and the faith of religion (reason), and ascribed to the latter alone an influence upon morality (4). The same was the case with the rationalists in general, who have sometimes been unjustly charged with giving countenance to the Roman Catholic doctrine of righteousness by works, in connection with their Pelagian tendencies (5). The Pietists and Methodists retained the strict views of Augustine, though with various modifications (6). The adherents of the modern theology, too, have either defined the idea of liberty in the Augustinian more than in the Pelagian sense, or endeavoured, from a higher point of view, to bring about a reconciliation between the two systems (7). Thus, too, the Augustinian and Calvinistic doctrine of *predestination* (8), despite the warning and threatening voice which *Herder* had once raised against the hand that should again renew the strife (9), was acutely defended by *Schleiermacher*, who endeavoured to remove its offensiveness (10). On the other hand, the advocates of its ruder form were led to pass a harsh and condemnatory sentence upon their opponents (11). Modern theology in general has endeavoured to overcome the harshness of the dogma, without giving up its deeper significancy (12).

(1) *Henke* maintained that it is indifferent whether emendatio precedes, or the pacatio animi; Lineamenta, cxxiii. But such indifference could not last. More profound in-

vestigations contributed to bring about a higher union. *Schleiermacher*, Christliche Glaubenslehre, Bd. ii. § 109 f. *Marheinecke*, Dogmatik, s. 301: "The idea of justification must be defined in accordance with the spirit of the Christian religion, as the union of the forgiveness of sins with the communication of love." Comp. also *Menken* and *Hahn* (in *Möhler*, Symbolik, s. 151—in reference to the fides formata). *Hase*, Dogmatik, s. 419–421. In modern times, however, the economy of redemption as propounded by earlier theologians has been again defended (in opposition to the Roman Catholic doctrine), in order to prevent its being refined away. See the work of *Baur*, in reply to Möhler, s. 235 ff. [In the Anglican literature, the works of *Davenant* (1631), Bp. *Downam* (1633), and *O'Brien*, Bp. of Ossory (against *Bull*), defended the Protestant doctrine, modified in the teachings of *Bull*, *Waterland*, and *Hooker*. The views of the Oxford School in *J. H. Newman's* Lects. on Justif. 1838. Comp. *Whately's* Errors of Romanism; *Heurtley's* Bampton Lectures, 1845; *M'Ilvaine's* Oxford Theology.—On the American discussions, see Princeton Essays, vol. i.; *Duffield* on *Finney*, in Bibl. Repos. 1845; *Albert Barnes*, How shall man be just with God? 1854; President *Lord's* Sermon on Justification, 1854.]

(2) In his Religion innerhalb der Grenzen der blossen Vernunft, s. 45: "That which man is in a moral sense *depends on his own exertions*. It must be the effect of his own free will, for otherwise he could not be responsible for it, and accordingly would be neither morally good nor morally bad." S. 46: "Notwithstanding the fall, the command is given: We *must* be better men; hence we must be *able* to be so. . . . At the same time it must be presupposed that a germ of good has remained in its original purity, that it could neither be destroyed nor corrupted; surely this germ cannot be self-love," etc. S. 53: "There is one thing in our soul, which if we attentively examine, we cannot cease to consider with the highest wonder, a wonder which is not only legitimate, but also serves to elevate our souls. This one thing is *the original moral nature of man*." . . . S. 58: "According to moral religion (an appellation which, of all the public forms of religion, can alone be applied to Christianity), it is a fundamental principle

that every one must use all possible efforts to become a better man" (Luke xix. 12–16). Comp. his Lehre vom kategorischen Imperativ (in the Kritik der praktischen Vernunft).

(3) Ibid. s. 52: "The moral culture of man must not commence with the *amendment of his conduct*, but with a *complete change in his mode of thinking*, and with the *basis of his character*." (Comp. the distinction which he made between *legality* and *morality*, Kritik der prakt. Vernunft, s. 106.)

(4) Ibid. s. 157 ff. Of course by religion he understands the religion of reason, into which historical faith must gradually pass over (s. 169). On the subject of divine grace (in accordance with the principles of the Kantian philosophy), comp. *Tieftrunk*, iii. s. 132 ff.; on the effects of grace, see s. 166 ff. By *saving faith* he understands (s. 204)—1. That man *himself* does what he can in order to obtain salvation; 2. That he trusts the *rest* to the wisdom of God.

(5) *Bengel* bitterly complained of the Pelagianism of his age; men had become increasingly strangers to the effects of grace, and that to such an extent, that Pelagius, if he could rise again in our day, would undoubtedly be dissatisfied with the present Pelagianism. See *Burk*, s. 238. The rationalists and the prosaic tendency of the age took offence principally at *the supernatural effects of grace;* see *J. J. Spalding*, Ueber den Werth der Gefühle, 1764. *J. L. Z. Junkheim*, Von dem Uebernatürlichen in den Gnadenwirkungen. For further particulars, see *Bretschneider*, Entw. s. 667 ff., and comp. *Wegscheider*, § 151 ff., particularly § 161 (De unione mystica). The rationalists acknowledged no other practical Christianity than that which manifests itself in external actions, and for the most part misunderstood the peculiar nature of mysticism, the dynamic in the doctrine concerning faith and its inner workings. On the other hand, Christian rationalism (in distinction from naturalism) always urged the importance of making the inner disposition the source of our actions, and rejected mere dead legal works; see *Wegscheider*, § 155, with reference to the words of Luther: "*Good and pious works never more make a good and pious man, but a good and pious man makes good works: the fruits do not bear the tree, but the tree bears the fruit.*" (*Walch*, xix. 1222 ff.) Comp. *Stäudlin*, Dogmatik, s. 417, and others, in *Hase*, Dogmatik, s. 419.

(6) The differences obtaining among the Pietists and Methodists had, for the most part, reference to the struggles of repentance, to the questions, whether grace may be lost or not, whether it is possible to attain moral perfection in this present life, to the unio mystica cum Deo, etc. Thus *Wesley* (1740) differed from the United Brethren in reference to the necessity of good works and the degrees of faith; see *Southey* (German by *Krummacher*), i. s. 298 ff.—*Wesley* and *Whitefield* separated from each other, because the former asserted the universality of grace, while the latter advocated the particularistic theory; see ibid. s. 330 ff.—The Pietists charged the United Brethren with a want of zeal in the work of sanctification.—*Bengel* charged *Zinzendorf* with Antinomianism: Abriss der Brüdergemeinde, s. 128 ff. In opposition to the doctrine of spiritual union (as the United Brethren understood it), he says, s. 145: "This doctrine has the appearance of the greatest spirituality, but in reality it offers richer food to the flesh than any mere man of the world can attain unto." Comp. on the other side, Idea Fidei Fratrum, § 118, § 149 ff., § 169 ff.—According to *Swedenborg* (in opposition to the doctrine of the Church and to the Moravians), the imputation of the merit of Christ is a word without meaning, unless we understand by it the forgiveness of sins *after* repentance; for nothing belonging to the Lord can be *imputed* to man, but He (the Lord) can *promise* salvation after man has repented, *i.e.* after he has seen and acknowledged his sins, and if he afterwards, from love to the Lord, abstain from them. This condition being fulfilled, the promise of salvation is made to man in such a manner that man cannot be saved by his own merit or his own righteousness, but by the Lord, who alone has fought with and overcome hell, etc. See Divine Revelation, i. s. 47. Ibid.: "There is a *Divine* faith and a *human* faith; those who repent possess Divine faith, but those who do not repent, and nevertheless believe in imputation, possess human faith."

(7) *De Wette* considered the subject in question in a twofold aspect, each of which may, in a certain sense, be justified (viz. the religious and the ethical aspect, that of faith and that of reflection); see his Religion und Theologie, s. 242 ff. (comp. his Dogmatik, § 76 ff.). *Hegel* used the word liberty

in a higher sense (contrasted with the liberty of choice), as liberty which results from union with God, so that in one sense all is grace, in another all is liberty, the acting of God appears as ours, and *vice versa;* see his Philosophie der Religion, i. s. 157. *Hase,* Hutterus Redivivus, s. 274, Anm. For a further theological discussion, comp. *Schleiermacher,* Glaubenslehre, ii. § 86–93, § 106–111; *Nitzsch,* Christl. Lehre, § 138 ff. [Comp. *Julius Müller,* Lehre von der Sünde, ii. 6–48 (on formal and real freedom), and 89–151 (transcendental and empirical freedom).]

(8) For a considerable time controversy respecting this doctrine had reposed. It was revived in the course of the eighteenth century by the work of *Joachim Lange,* Die evangelische Lehre von der allgemeinen Gnade, Halle 1732. *J. J. Waldschmidt,* a pastor in Hessen, defended the Calvinistic doctrine in opposition to Lange, 1735. For the further progress of this controversy, see *Schlegel,* Kg. des 18 Jahrh. ii. 1, s. 304; *Von Einem,* ii. s. 323.

(9) In his work, Vom Geist des Christenthums, s. 154 (Dogmatik, s. 234): "Fortunately our age has consigned to oblivion all these unscriptural and unspiritual errors, as well as the entire controversy respecting various gifts, which was carried on in a most unchristian spirit, *and may the hand wither that shall ever bring it back!*" (Herder agreed with his contemporaries in their low estimate of Augustine and his teaching respecting the workings of grace; for further passages, comp. his Dogmatik, s. 230 ff.)

(10) See the essay, Ueber die Lehre von der Erwählung (Theologische Zeitschrift, herausgegeben von *Schleiermacher, De Wette,* and *Lücke,* Heft 1, s. 1 ff.). On the other side: *De Wette,* Ueber die Lehre von der Erwählung, etc. (Theologische Zeitschrift, Heft 2, s. 83 ff.). *Bretschneider* (in the Oppositionsschrift von *Schröter* und *Klein,* 4, s. 1–83). *Schleiermacher,* Christlicher Glaube, ii. § 117–120. The milder aspect which he gave to the doctrine in question consists in regarding election, not as referring to the lot of man after death, but to the earlier or later admission to fellowship with Christ. The literature is given by *Bretschneider,* Entw. s. 677 ff. [*Schleiermacher* maintained the general Calvinistic doctrine, but "abolished its dualism by

the idea of an universal world-organism, which for the completion of the race demands in the individual every grade of spiritual capacity; also looking to the conversion of all in a future life." *Strauss* says that he brought the doctrine out of the theological sphere into the philosophical, and really made the question to be, whether there could be an independent human agency alongside of the supreme divine causality. See *Baur*, s. 392.— Comp. *Geo. Stanley*, Faber, Primitive doctrine of Election ("ecclesiastical individualism"), 2d ed. 1842. *J. B. Mozley*, Augustinian Doctrine of Predestination, Lond. 1855.]

(11) The views of *Abr. Booth*, advanced in his work, The Reign of Grace (German by *Krummacher*, Elberf. 1831), were combated by *J. P. Lange*, Lehre der heiligen Schrift von der freien und allgemeinen Gnade Gottes, ibid. 1831.—On the Methodist controversy, see note 6. The doctrine of Predestination has found in *Kohlbrügge* a new defender among the Reformed.

(12) Comp. *e.g. J. P. Lange*, Dogmatik, ii. s. 956; *Martensen*, s. 338 ff. (polemical against Schleiermacher). *Ebrard*, i. s. 120, 339, 356 ff., ii. s. 688 ff. (making a distinction between the theological and the anthropological question). See also *E. W. Krummacher*, Das Dogma von der Gnadenwahl, Duisburg 1856, and *Lange*, art. "Vorherbestimmung," in *Herzog*, xvii. s. 397 f.—The question has been discussed between *Schweizer* and *Ebrard* on the relation of the dogmatic system of the Reformed Church to necessarianism (determinism); the former represented this doctrine as the life of the Reformed system, in his Glaubenslehre d. Ref. Kirche, etc. (Zürich 1844), and in the "Prot. Centraldogmen" (Zürich 1855, 1856); see *Ebrard*, Das Verhältniss d. ref. Dogmatik, etc., 1849.

FOURTH DIVISION.

THE CHURCH. THE SACRAMENTS. ESCHATOLOGY.

§ 302.

The Doctrines concerning the Church.

As the spirit of the Church became lost in that of the world, it could hardly be expected that the Church should retain a clear sense of her existence and functions. The perverted Protestantism of the so-called illumination period saw in every approach to an independent development of ecclesiastical life a hierarchical tendency opposed to the State. After the chancellor *Pfaff*, in Würtemberg, had defended what is called the collegial system of the Church in opposition to the territorial system (1), the latter was advocated by those who regarded the Church as an institution which the State may use for disciplinary purposes, or who at the utmost admitted the "utility of the ministerial (preaching) office" (2). Considering this want of general ecclesiastical life, it cannot be a matter of surprise that a growing desire after Christian fellowship manifested itself among individuals, which led to the formation of smaller Churches within the Church universal, such as the Society of the United Brethren (3). Others, *e.g. Swedenborg*, despairing of the present, built up the Church of a New Jerusalem in the ideal world in which they lived (4). *Kant* alone rose above the ordinary spirit of the "illumination," by directing attention once more to the importance and necessity of a society

based upon moral principles, or the establishment of the kingdom of God upon earth (5). But he rested satisfied with the merely moral aspect; while the deeper religious life of the Church can be founded only upon more spiritual views of religion in general, and above all, upon a living Christology. On this account modern theologians have come to discuss the doctrine concerning the Church even more fully than the Reformers (6). The development of the Canon Law, and of ecclesiastical government, kept pace with the development of the doctrine. On the one hand, Church and State are entirely separated from each other, *e.g.* in the United States of America (7), which has in recent times also been attempted in Scotland, and in the Canton de Vaud in accordance with the theoretical views of *Vinet;* on the other hand, some speculative theologians (in this represented by *Rothe*) have sought to bring about a higher union of both *in* the State (8); others, again, take an intermediate position, asserting that Church and State are distinguishable in idea, but practically must exert a living influence upon each other (9).—*Puseyism* advanced anew, on behalf of the Church of England, the privileges of the episcopal succession from the days of the apostles (10). The *Irvingites* demanded a new apostolate, and the restitution of the offices of the apostolic Church (11). The *Darbyites* (a sect of the Plymouth Brethren) professed to see a falling away in the very first days of the Church, and sought to repair the loss by the formation of small congregations of regenerate Christians, while they abandoned every regular clerical office in the Church (12). On the other side, in the New-Lutheran Church of Germany, the idea of the *ministry* has been emphasized in such a way as to awaken anew the fear of a hierarchy, and to call out strong opposition (13).

(1) *Pfaff*, de Originibus Juris ecclesiastici variaque ejusdem indole, Tub. 1719, 4to; in 1720 published with a new essay, De Successione Episcopali. The Church is a society, a *col-*

legium which has its own laws and privileges. The rights which princes possess in ecclesiastical matters are conferred upon them by the Church (silently or expressly?). See *Schröckh*, vii. s. 549, and *Stahl*, Kirchenrecht, s. 37 ff. On the other hand, the so-called territorial system, first propounded by *Thomasius* (see § 256, note 4), was more fully developed by *Just. Henning Böhmer* (died 1749) and others.

(2) See *Spalding*, Von der Nutzbarkeit des Predigtamts. He was combated by *Herder* in the Provinzialblätter.

(3) *Zinzendorf* did not intend to found a sect, but to establish an *ecclesiola in ecclesia;* see *Spangenberg*, Idea Fidei Fratrum, s. 542: "The United Brethren consider themselves *as a very small part of the visible Church* of our Lord Jesus Christ. . . . Since they hold the same doctrines as those of the Evangelical Church (set forth in the Confessio August.), they see no reason for separating from it. . . . Those are right who regard the congregations of the United Brethren as institutions founded by our Lord Jesus Christ in His Church, in order to present a barrier to the flood of corruption now breaking in upon doctrine and life. The opinion of those is well founded who regard them as an hospital in which our Lord Jesus Christ, the only physician of souls, has collected many of the sick and miserable to care for them, and that their wants may be supplied by His servants."

(4) Divine Revelation of *Swedenborg*, ii. s. 84: "The Church is in man; the Church which is without man is a Church composed of many in whom the Church is."—The Church is where the word of God is rightly understood.—Swedenborg finds the Church typified in the whole of the Old Testament. By the New Jerusalem spoken of in the Book of Revelation he understands the new Church as regards her doctrines (ibid. i. s. 132). The new doctrine, hitherto concealed but now revealed by Swedenborg, constitutes the new Church, or the Church of the New Jerusalem (s. 138 f., and in several other places).

(5) In his Religion innerhalb der Grenzen der blossen Vernunft, third section, s. 119 ff., comp. the fourth chapter, concerning "Religion und Pfaffenthum," s. 211 ff.

(6) In common with the rationalists, the adherents of formal supernaturalism lost the more profound insight into the nature

of the Church. Thus *Reinhard* treated of the Church in a very external, desultory, and negative manner, s. 614 ff. Comp. *Röhr*, Briefe über Rationalismus, s. 409 ff. (quoted by *Hase*, Dogm. s. 455). *Wegscheider*, Instit. § 185 ff., gives better definitions. — *Schleiermacher* returned to that view, according to which the Church is a living organism (the body of Christ), and he viewed it in connection with the doctrine of the Holy Spirit, who is the spirit of communion; see his Chr. Glaube, i. § 6, s. 35–40, § 22, s. 125 ff.; ii. § 121 ff., § 125, s. 306 ff. Comp. *De Wette*, Religion und Theologie, s. 267 ff.; Dogmatik, § 94. *Twesten*, i. s. 107 ff. *Nitzsch*, s. 306 ff.—The adherents of the speculative philosophy regard the Church "as God existing in the congregation," or "as the religious side of the State." But the Gnostic distinction which they make between those who believe and those who know, would naturally prevent them from forming any just idea of the Church. See *Hegel*, Phil. der Religion, ii. s. 257 ff. *Marheinecke*, Dogm. s. 320 ff. *Strauss* (Dogmatik, ii. s. 616) further explains the Hegelian view as implying that philosophers should not be compelled to belong to any particular Church, but thinks it very strange that separation from Church-fellowship should be the result of a philosophical examination. Comp. *Biedermann*, Die freie Theologie, s. 201 ff.—More recent doctrinal statements concerning the Church, see in *Lange*, Dogmatik, ii. 2, s. 1081 ff.—According to him, the Church "is the founding and development of the salvation and life of Christ in the social sphere," and "the typical commencement of the world's transfiguration." Similarly *Martensen*, s. 378. On the polarity of the Church, as cœtus Sanctorum and mater fidelium, see *Ebrard*, s. 404 ff.; on its completion in the kingdom of Christ, ibid. s. 730 ff.—"*The Protestant Church is a developing, but not a fully developed Church; it is the Church of the future.*" *Schenkel*, Protestantismus, iii. 1, s. 202.

(7) This independence of the Church in relation to the State is connected with the independence of the citizens in relation to the Church and to ecclesiastical institutions, and with the liberty of worship. Comp. *Vinet*, Mémoire en faveur de la Liberté des Cultes, Paris 1826 (comp. *Hagenbach* in the Studien und Kritiken, 1829, ii. s. 418); De la conviction religieuse,

Paris 1843.—On the Scotch National Church and the disturbances in the Canton de Vaud, see *Nicdner*, Kirchengeschichte, s. 866, 886; *Agénor de Gasparin*, Intérêts généraux du Protestantisme Français, Paris 1843.—On the Scotch Church, see Life of T. Chalmers, by Hanna; Life of T. Guthrie, etc.

(8) *R. Rothe*, Die Anfänge der Christlichen Kirche und ihrer Verfassung, Wittenb. 1837; Ethik, ii. s. 89 ff., s. 145 f.: "As long as the single national State has not completed its development (as a State), the extent of the ethical communion of the people is not yet completely embraced in their religious fellowship; that is, the political body (the State) does not include and swallow up the religious communions. In such a state of things there must of course be a Church alongside of the State. *But the Church as a distinct body must also recede and be dissolved just in proportion as the State approximates to the perfection of its development.*" [Comp. *Gladstone* on Church and State. *H. W. Wilberforce*, Hist. of Erastianism, 1851. *R. J. Wilberforce*, Inquiry into Principles of Church Authority, 1855. *Pusey* on Royal Supremacy, 1849. Among English writers, *Coleridge* and *Arnold* approximate to the views of Rothe. Comp. also *Geffcken*, Staat u. Kirche, and in English, 2 vols.]

(9) *F. J. Stahl*, Die Kirchenverfassung nach Lehre und Recht der Protestanten, Erl. 1840. (Second Appendix.)

(10) See the statements of the Oxford divines in the work of *Weaver-Amthor*, s. 16 ff. *Hook* (Sermons on the Church Establishment): "The only office to which the Lord has pledged His presence is that of the bishops, the successors of the first commissioned apostles, and to the rest of the clergy, so far as they are sanctioned by the bishops and act under their authority." *Keble* and *Newman* in the Evangelical [British?] Magazine, p. 68: "The gift of the Holy Spirit is preserved to the world only by the episcopal succession; and to strive for communion with Christ by any other channel is to attempt what is impossible."

(11) They call themselves the Catholic Apostolic Church. Their offices are those of apostles, prophets, evangelists, pastors, and teachers. See Narrative of Events affecting the Position and Prospects of the whole Christian Church, Lond. 1847. *W. H. Darby*, The Irvingites, in German by *Poseck*,

Berl. 1850. A short sketch by *Stockmeier*, Irvingismus, Basel 1850. [Life of Irving, by Mrs. *Oliphant*.]

(12) *John Darby* is their founder, and they sprang from the Plymouth Brethren; their organ is the "Christian Witness." Comp. *Herzog*, Les frères de Plymouth et John Darby, Lausanne 1845. *Godet*, Examen des vues des Darbyistes sur le saint ministère, Neufchâtel 1846, and *Herzog's* Realenc. xi. s. 764. [Comp. also *Miss Whately*, Plymouth Brethrenism, London 1878, etc.]

(13) *F. Delitzsch*, Vier Bücher von der Kirche, Dresden 1847. *Löhe*, Kirche und Amt, Erlangen 1851. *Münchmeier*, Sichtbare und unsichtbare Kirche, 1855. *Kliefoth*, Acht Bücher von der Kirche, Schwerin 1854. *Harless*, Kirche und Amt nach luth. Lehre, Stuttg. 1853. *C. Lechler*, Neutest. Lehre vom heiligen Amte, Stuttg. 1857. *W. Preger*, Die Geschichte vom geistlichen Amte, auf Grund der Rechtfertigungslehre, Nördling. 1857. See *Palmer's* art. "Geistliche," in *Herzog's* Realenc. iv. s. 749; and the art. "Kirche," by *A. Hauber*, ib. s. 560 ff.

Several questions of a more practical nature, *e.g.* those concerning the rights of princes in matters of worship, the constitution of Synods, the presbyterian form of Church government, the obligation of ministers to sign the symbolical books of the Church to which they belong, the relation of the various denominations to each other, etc., have frequently been discussed in modern times. See the acts of the General Synod, held at Berlin 1846, the 18th and following sessions, and the transactions of the Baden Ecclesiastical Controversy.

In the *Roman Catholic Church* a controversy was carried on between the Curialists and Episcopalians. Jansenism made its appearance in Germany as Febronianism (see *Klee*, Dg. i. s. 99). The French Revolution seemed to have annihilated the Church; but it rose again with new vigour. Concerning its further development and the various politico-ecclesiastical systems, see the works on ecclesiastical history and canon law. Respecting the controversy to which mixed marriages and the relation to Protestant States gave rise, see ibid.

§ 303.

The Means of Grace.[1] (*The Sacraments.*)

Protestants continued generally to hold the doctrine of two sacraments (1), *Baptism* and *the Lord's Supper*. The denominational differences between the Lutherans and the

[1] On the Word of God, see above, § 291.

Calvinists, to which the doctrine of the Lord's Supper had given rise, were still in existence at the commencement of the present period (2). But the position of the Socinians, that the sacraments are mere ceremonies, being in better accordance with the tendency of rationalism (3), the Lutheran theologians gradually abandoned their former rigid views (4), so that at last the denominational differences were lost sight of, in consequence of the wider spread of indifferentism. Those only who had retained some idea of grace continued to attach importance to the means of grace (5). The rationalists adopted in the main the theory of Zwingli (6), whilst that of Calvin was more fully developed by the adherents of a mediating theology in particular, and served as the basis of ecclesiastical union (7). The old Lutheran view, however, was also revived in its most rigid form, and adopted by many (8); this was still more the case as modern philosophers interpreted it speculatively (9). Anabaptist views concerning baptism have given rise to controversies in our own day (10). Inasmuch as the more unprejudiced of the Protestant theologians gradually admitted that infant baptism was not expressly commanded in Scripture, *Schleiermacher* and his followers endeavoured to defend the ecclesiastical usage, by regarding the act of confirmation as a complement of that of baptism (11). The strict Lutherans still hold to the objective significance of the sacrament of baptism in its full extent (12). The Puseyites make the connection between spiritual regeneration and water baptism to be [generally] essential (13). [It is on the subject of the sacraments that the principal controversies have taken place in the Church of England since the publication of the Tracts for the Times. The High Church party challenged the position of the Evangelicals in reference to baptism, which led to the Gorham judgment (14), according to which the views of Low Churchmen were declared to be not untenable on the sacrament of Baptism. On the other side, the Low Church party assailed the teaching of High Churchmen with respect to the

Lord's Supper; and this led to the Denison case (15), which was not concluded, and to the Bennett judgment (16), which obtained for High Churchmen the same liberty in regard to this sacrament which the Gorham judgment had secured for Low Churchmen in regard to baptism. Out of the Eucharistic Controversy sprang the Ritualistic (17), which is still undecided.]

(1) *Augusti* gave the preference to the threefold division into Baptism, the Lord's Supper, and Absolution, which he compared (as an anti-climax) to the Trinity (Baptism the sacrament of the Holy Spirit, the Lord's Supper that of the Son, and Absolution that of the Father as the Supreme Judge). See his System der christlichen Dogmatik, 2d ed. s. 278–281, Preface, s. 6; and his Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte, s. 382. *Karrer* agreed with him (*Bertholdt's* Krit. Journal, xii.). *Ammon* (Summa Doctrinæ, 3d ed. p. 251) would like to number, if it were suitable, the redditio animæ in manus Domini among the sacraments; and *Kaiser* (Monogrammata, s. 224) held that Confirmation and the laying on of hands are sacraments (see *Augusti*, Dg. l.c.).—*Goethe*, from the æsthetic point of view, defended the Roman Catholic doctrine of seven sacraments (in his Aus meinem Leben, ii. s. 117 ff., Stuttg. 1829). —The Moravian Brethren have introduced among themselves the washing of feet, the kiss of charity, and the casting of lots, as usages, without regarding them as sacraments; they attach, however, high significance to the first of these; see Idea Fidei Fratrum, s. 546 ff.[1] In addition to the Lord's Supper, they also celebrate the love-feast.—As regards the idea of sacrament, several theologians took the ground that the term *sacrament* is not very judiciously chosen. See *Storr*, Doctrina Christiana, § 108 ss. *Reinhard*, s. 556: "It would have been better either not to introduce into systematic theology the term sacrament, which is used in so many senses, and does not once occur in Holy Writ, or to use it in the free and indefinite manner of the earlier Church." Comp. *Schleier-*

[1] The ceremony (not sacrament) of footwashing had, however, fallen into disuse at the beginning of this century, and was definitely abolished at the Synod of 1818. See *Burckhardt*, l.c. 176.

macher, Christ. Glaub., Bd. ii. s. 415 ff. S. 416: "The common mode of commencing with this so-called general idea, and explaining it, serves to confirm the erroneous opinion that it is a proper doctrinal idea, involving something essential to Christianity, and that Baptism and the Lord's Supper are of so much importance principally because this idea is therein realized."—The Idea Fidei Fratrum treats only of Baptism and the Lord's Supper, without discussing the idea of sacrament, s. 275 ff. See on the other side, *Hase*, Dogmatik, s. 529, and *Schenkel* (Protestantismus, i. s. 393 ff.), who gives prominence in express terms to the objective idea of sacrament.—*Martensen* (Dogmatik, s. 470) says that "the sacred pledges of the new covenant contain an actual bestowal of the nature and life of the risen Christ, who does not merely give redemption and completion to the spiritual, but also to the corporeal." *Ebrard*, ii. 1, distinguishes the "word of God," as a means of grace, from the sacraments, in such a way as to make the former the instrumental cause of the converting (*metanoëtic*) energy of the Holy Ghost; and the sacraments, on the other hand, to be means of grace for the objective, regenerating (*anagennetic*) energy of the same Spirit, considered as the Spirit of Christ.

(2) In the year 1714, *L. Ch. Sturm*, former professor of mathematics in the University of Frankfurt, who had seceded from the Lutheran to the Reformed Church, published his "Mathematisch. Beweis vom Abendmahle," in which he (like Schwenkfeld, § 259, note 15) confounded the subject and the predicate of the words used by our Lord, by explaining τοῦτο as equivalent to τοιοῦτο. He was opposed by *J. A. Fabricius*, *J. G. Reinbeck*, *F. Buddeus*, and others. About the middle of the eighteenth century, *Ch. August Heumans*,[1] himself a Lutheran, dared to attempt the proof "that the doctrine of the Reformed Church concerning the Lord's Supper is the right and true one." His work did not so much lead Calvinists to engage in a controversy, as give rise to dissensions among the Lutheran theologians themselves. See *Schlegel*, Kircheng. des 18 Jahrh. ii. s. 307 ff. *Von Einem*, s. 325 ff.

[1] He held this view privately as early as 1740, and avowed it, 1755, in his explanation of the New Testament (on 1 Cor. xi. 24); but it was even then suppressed before the publication of the work. He next wrote the above essay in 1762, which was not published, however, till after his death, 1764.

(3) The writings of rationalists abounded in trivial matters even on liturgical points. Thus *K. R. Lange* proposed (in Hufnagel's liturgische Blätter, Bd. i. Smml. 6) the following formula for use at the administration of the Lord's Supper: "Partake of this bread! may the spirit of devotion bestow all his blessings upon you. Partake of a little wine! Virtue is not in this wine, it is in you, in the divine doctrine, and in God." See *Knapp*, Liturgische Grundsätze, Erl. 1831, s. 349.

(4) *Ernesti* defended the Lutheran interpretation of the words of institution on exegetical grounds (Opuscula Theologica, p. 135 ss.), but expressed his sorrow that many were more inclined to adopt that view, quæ rationi humanæ expeditior est et mollior. The supernaturalists *Storr* and *Reinhard* were satisfied with a more indefinite statement of the Lutheran doctrine; *Storr*, Doctr. Christ. § 114; *Reinhard*, s. 588 (604). *Knapp* went so far as to say (Bd. ii. s. 482): "The doctrine of the presence of Christ in the Lord's Supper should never have been made an article of faith, but should have been regarded as among the theological problems." Others, *e.g. Hahn*, *Lindner*, and *Schwarz*, endeavoured to help the Lutheran doctrine by introducing their own explanations. See *Hase*, Dogmatik, s. 583.

(5) The Pietists and Moravian Brethren retained the most firmly the idea of *means of grace*. — The mystics gave prominence to the specific dynamic efficacy of the sacraments, and hesitated, in respect to the Lord's Supper, to interpret the words of institution in a purely tropical sense. Thus *Oetinger* (Theologie, s. 345): "We must be very cautious about perverting any word of the Holy Ghost, so as to make of it a merely metaphorical figure of speech. The fulness of the spirit is attenuated by thin and lean interpretations. A man with a good, sound heart, feels more than can be expressed in words; and so we must let the words stand in all their fulness." See also his Lehrtafel, s. 297 (in *Auberlen*, s. 408): "As the fulness of the Godhead dwells in Christ bodily, it also imparts itself bodily to the water, blood, and spirit, in baptism and the supper. For regeneration comes of spirit and water, both in creaturely wise: spirit is the *causa materialis*, not *efficiens*,—despite the scandal of philosophers about materialism." Ibid. s. 373 (in *Auberlen*, s. 409): "Water and blood

are penetrated with the fire of the Holy Ghost." Evangel. i. s. 286 ff. (in *Auberlen*, s. 436): "As it is by the invisible, universally-diffused essence and substance of Christ that the equally invisible power of the bread and the wine is made to nourish all men, although they be merely earthly men; so, too, must the new, invisible, inward man be nurtured and preserved by this selfsame, universally-present substance and essence of Christ. We all have body and soul. The spirit from Christ's body offers himself daily to all, that they may receive him into the essence of their body and soul, and transform their mortal nature. Angels eat the bread of angels. The Israelites in the wilderness ate the manna ignorantly; but Christ gives clear and full understanding (John vi.)." On Oetinger's positive relation to the Lutheran, and negative relation to the Reformed and Roman Catholic doctrine, see *Auberlen*, s. 323, 336, 415, 426–428. On his position as to the early Church, see s. 442 ff.

(6) The rationalists differed among themselves. The strict Lutheran doctrine was of course excluded. Many adopted what we may call the intermediate view of Zwingli; others fell down into the Socinian theory, and even lower; while some rose up as high as the Calvinistic view. *Benjamin Hoadley*, in the Anglican Church, a friend of the Arian, Samuel Clarke, defended the Socinian theory in his treatise: Of the Nature and End of the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, Lond. 1735. He was combated by *Whiston*, *Waterland*, and *Mill*, defending the doctrine of the 39 Articles. See *Schlegel*, l.c. *Von Einem*, ii. s. 530, ii. 2, s. 751.—*Henke* followed Schwenkfeld in the interpretation of the words of institution, Lineamenta, cxxxvii. p. 250.—*Tieftrunk* adopted the view of Kant, that the design of the Lord's Supper is to awaken and develope a spirit of cosmopolitan brotherhood; see his Censur, s. 296 ff. (comp. *Kant*, Religion innerhalb der Grenzen der blossen Vernunft, s. 282). The better class of German rationalists explained the ordinance in its memorial and symbolical significance, in a becoming spirit, insisting on its profound moral import, and in accordance with the spirit of Zwingli. See especially *D. Schulz*, Die Lehre vom Abendmahl; and compare *Wegscheider*, § 180*a*. He regards the elements used in the Lord's Supper not merely as signa significantia, but as

signa exhibitiva; and thus approximates to the Calvinistic view.

(7) *Schleiermacher,* Christliche Glaubenslehre, ii. § 139 ff., s. 388 ff. *De Wette,* Dogmatik, § 93. *Nitzsch,* Christlich. Lehr. s. 317. *Ebrard,* Das Dogma vom heiligen Abendmahl, Bd. ii. s. 785 ff.; and his Dogmatik, s. 631 ff. Compare the article "Abendmahl," of *Julius Müller,* in *Herzog's* Realenc. i. s. 21 ff.

(8) *Scheibel,* Das Abendmahl des Herrn, Breslau 1823. *Sartorius,* Vertheidigung der lutherischen Abendmahlslehre, in the Dorpat Beiträge, 1832, Bd. i. s. 305 ff. *Th. Schwarz,* Ueber das Wesen des heiligen Abendmahls (in *Ebrard,* s. 774). The innumerable recent controversial writings (by *Kahnis, Rudelbach, Rodaz, Ströbel*) we cannot here so particularly cite. The Lutheran view is most comprehensively presented in *Kahnis,* Die Lehre vom Abendmahl, Leipz. 1851 (against *Ebrard*). See also *Rückert,* Das Abendmahl, 1856, and *Baur,* in Theol. Jahrb. 1857.

(9) *Hegel,* Phil. der Religion, Bd. ii. s. 274: "The idea involved in the *Lutheran* doctrine is this, that the motion begins with the external (element), which is an ordinary and common thing; but that the participation, the consciousness of the presence of God, is brought about, so far as the external element is *consumed,* not merely corporeally, but in spirit and in faith. God is present only in spirit and faith. . . . Here is no transubstantiation in the common sense of the word, but yet a transubstantiation by which the external is abolished and the presence of God is purely spiritual, *so that the faith of the participant is essential.*" (The last idea is not in accordance with the Lutheran view; comp. § 259, note 10.)

(10) The Anabaptists (Neutäufer) in Switzerland, Baptists in England, America, and the Continent.—*Oncken* in Hamburg (from the year 1834).—The Anabaptists (Wiedertäufer) in Würtemberg (from the year 1787); see *Grüneisen,* Abriss einer Geschichte der religiösen Gemeinschaften in Würtemberg, mit besonderer Rücksicht auf die neuen Taufgesinnten, in Illgens Zeitschrift für historische Theologie, 1841, i. s. 64 ff.

(11) *Schleiermacher,* Christ. Glaube, ii. § 138, s. 382 ff.

(12) *W. Hofmann,* Tauf und Wiedertaufe, Stuttg. 1843. *Martensen,* Die christliche Taufe und die baptistische Frage,

Hamburg 1843; see also his Dogmatik, s. 398. *Höfling*, Das Sacrament der Taufe, Erlangen 1846, Bd. i. s. 26: "The chief point is, and remains, that we recognize the grace of God, the Spirit of God, God Himself, as working with us *in*, *with*, and *under* the water of the baptism; so that by means of this act we receive regeneration, our actual reception and transition into the saving and life-giving fellowship with Christ, justification and the blessed life." Compare the acts of the Frankfurt Church Diet, 1854.

(13) *Pusey* on Holy Baptism; in the work of *Weaver-Amthor*, s. 22 ff.

[(14) An English clergyman, *Gorham*, was presented to a benefice, and refused by Dr. Phillpotts, Bishop of Exeter. The case was tried before the ecclesiastical courts, and it was decided (1850) that the "hypothetical" view of baptismal regeneration was legally tenable in the Church of England. Hence the liberty of the Evangelical party.]

[(15) Archdeacon *Denison* was tried before the Court of Arches (1856) for Eucharistic teaching contained in two ordination sermons. He was condemned; but an appeal on a technical point was entered which prevented the case being tried in the higher court, in consequence of which the question remained practically undetermined. See *G. Denison*, Notes of my Life, Lond. 1868. Defence of Archdeacon Denison, 1858, etc.]

[(16) The case of the Rev. *W. J. Bennett*, of Frome, was in some respects a continuation of the Denison case. *Bennett* modified some of his statements; and the result was that the final court of appeal decided that his teaching was tenable in the Church (1872). His teaching included a presence of Christ objective, but spiritual, in the sacrament, and the worship of Christ spiritually present in the Eucharist.]

[(17) The Ritualistic movement has given rise to several actions in the ecclesiastical courts. The controversy, in many of its details, remains unsettled.]

§ 304.

Eschatology.

Flügge, Geschichte des Glaubens an Unsterblichkeit, Auferstehung, Gericht und Vergeltung, Leipz. 1794–1800. *Weisse*, Die philos. Bedeutung der Lehre von den letzten Dingen (Studien u. Kritiken, 1836, s. 271 ff.). *Kling*, art. "Eschatologie," in *Herzog's* Realenc. iv. s. 154 ff. [Abp. *Whately*, Revelations of a Future State, 1855. *Alger*, Belief in Immortality. *Maurice*, Theol. Essays, Essays and Reviews, Lond. 1860. *A. Jukes*, The Restitution of all Things, Lond. 1853. *E. White*, Life in Christ, Lond. 1846. *E. H. Plumptre*, The Spirits in Prison, Lond. 1871. *F. W. Farrar*, Eternal Hope, Five Sermons, Lond. 1878.] *Goulburn*, in reply, 1880.

The decline of Church-life during the period of rationalism appeared to the more religious to portend a defection from pure Christianity; and in proportion to the clearness of such indications, the higher were their expectations as to the near approach of the end of all things. *Bengel* (1) and *Jung Stilling* (2) endeavoured to ascertain the exact period when this event would take place. The former fixed upon the year 1836. In opposition to these positive expectations, the rationalists sought to explain away the Scriptural doctrine of the second advent of Christ (3), and to limit the duration of the pains of hell (4). Earlier hypotheses, *e.g.* concerning the sleep of the soul, the migration of souls, Hades, etc., were also revived, and their number increased by new ones (5). Nevertheless, both rationalists and supernaturalists retained the hope of man's personal existence after death; not only those who believed in a revelation, like *Lavater*, but also the leaders of rationalism looked hopefully into the world to come (6). *Kant* examined the arguments commonly advanced in support of the doctrine of immortality (as he had done in reference to the existence of God), and approved only of the *moral* argument (for the practical reason) (7). In opposition to that form of belief in immortality which had lost its Christian basis, and had its real origin in selfish motives, the modern philosophy and theology justly insisted upon that

idea of *eternal life* which, as Christ Himself taught, was to begin upon earth (8). But this idea in connection with the free admission, that we could form no definite conception of the future state (9), led *some* of the disciples of modern speculation to a total denial of a future state, and a deification of the present life (10); while *others* endeavoured to place on a firmer basis the Church doctrine of the last things by means of the same philosophy (11). The prophetical parts of the Old and New Testament were also investigated anew in view of their didactic contents; what was veiled in vision and image was applied to the establishment of a theosophic and apocalyptic eschatology (12). Even millenarianism (chiliasm) struck new roots in those who held Church doctrine, especially among those of a pietistic tendency (13). That the kingdom of God, which has its commencement and completion in Jesus Christ, the only-begotten Son of God, is ever approaching; that the idea of a glorified union of the human with the divine by means of a living faith in Christ, in relation to the whole as well as to individuals, will be more and more realized in the fulness of time; and that, amid all the changes of forms, the spirit of Christianity will always remain the *incorruptible inheritance* of humanity, is a hope reaching far beyond a coarse millenarianism, and which we are justified in cherishing by the consideration of the course which, amidst numerous conflicts and errors, the development of Christian theology has taken to the present hour (14).

(1) In his Erklärte Offenb. Joh. oder vielmehr Jesu Christi, aus dem Grundtext übersetzt, durch die prophetischen Zahlen aufgeschlossen, und Allen, die auf das Werk und Wort des Herrn achten, und dem, was vor der Thüre ist, würdiglich entgegen zu kommen begehren, vor Augen gelegt durch *Joh. Albr. Bengel*, Stuttg. 1740.—Sechzig erbauliche Reden über die Offenb. Joh., sammt einer Nachlese gleichen Inhalts, etc., 1747.—Cyclus, sive de anno magno solis, lunæ, stellarum consideratio ad incrementum doctrinæ propheticæ atque astronomicæ accommodata, Ulm 1745. For the controversial writings

to which his works gave rise, see *Burk's* Leben Bengels, s. 260 (and in Eng.), and the chronological table (Zeittafel), s. 273. Comp. *Lücke*, Einl. in die Offenb. Joh. s. 548 ff. *Oetinger* looked into the future in the spirit of Bengel (see *Auberlen*, s. 516 ff.).[1] *Magnus Friedrich Roos*, Auslegung der Weissagungen Daniels, 1771; see the Appendix to *Auberlen's* work on Daniel [transl. Edinb. 1859]. *John Michael Hahn* and others.

(2) In his Siegesgeschichte der christl. Kirche, oder gemeinnützige Erklärung der Offenbarung Johannis, Nürnb. 1779. Appendix, 1805, 1822. *J. F. v. Meyer* on Sheol, etc., followed *Stilling*.

(3) *Henke*, Lineamenta, cxiv.: Atqui his in oraculis (Scripturæ S.) non omnia, ut sonant, verba capienda: multa ad similitudinem formæ judiciorum humanorum et pompæ regiæ expressa esse illi etiam fatentur, qui adspectabile aliquod judicium, a Christo ipso per sensibilem speciem præsenti in his terris agendum, præfiguratum esse atque præstituto tempore vere actum iri defendunt. Interim vel sic, destrictis quasi exuviis orationis, remanent multa, quæ non modo obscuritatis, sed etiam offensionis plurimum habent, etc. . . . Insunt vero istis rerum, quas futuras esse prædixerunt, imaginibus hæ simul graves et piæ sententiæ: 1. Vitam hominibus post fata instauratum iri, eosque etsi eosdem, non tamen eodem modo victuros esse; 2. Sortem cujusque in hac vita continuata talem futuram, qualem e sententia Christi, h. e. ad veritatis et justitiæ amussim, promeruerit; 3. Plane novam fore rerum faciem in isthac altera vita, et longe alias novæ civitatis sedes; 4. Animo semper bene composito et pervigilanti, magnam illam rerum nostrarum conversionem, ne inopinatos oprimat, expectandam esse. Comp. *Wegscheider*, Institutt. § 199, 200. *Herder* (Von der Auferstehung) and *De Wette* (Religion und Theologie, s. 259 ff.) endeavoured to make a distinction between the symbols and that which is signified by them. See note 13.

(4) Some supernaturalists also propound milder views. On

[1] *Oetinger* himself says of *Bengel* (s. 529): "The whole Revelation of John is now more than ever made intelligible by the help of that man of God, Bengel; and now all that is necessary may be understood with *great comprehensibility* (!), like a symmetrical building."

the contrary, others defended the eternity of punishment. Even *Lessing*, in opposition to the rationalism of an Eberhard, defends the eternity of the pains of hell from the philosophical point of view of determinism; but it would be a mistake to see in his deductions a defence of the Church doctrine. See *Schwartz*, Lessing as a theologian, Halle 1854, s. 83 ff. *Kant* numbered such queries among those *childish questions* from which the inquirer could learn nothing, even were they answered (Religion innerhalb der Grenzen der blossen Vernunft, s. 83, note). The literature is given by *Bretschneider*, Entwurf; comp. s. 886 ff. *Schleiermacher* (Glaubensl. § 163) expresses the hope "that through the power of redemption one day a universal restitution of souls may result." Comp. Güder in *Herzog's* Realenc. vi. s. 181: "*Here we must acknowledge with the ancients: De eo statuere non est humani judicii.*" [In England the discussion of this subject was revived by the publication of *Maurice's* Theological Essays, in which the writer, although speaking with great modesty, expressed a hope that the future of the condemned might be less dark than was generally believed. In consequence of this Essay he had to resign his professorship of Church History at King's College, London. The Essays and Reviews raised the question again, which led to a decision of the ecclesiastical courts that the expression of such a hope was not unlawful for a teacher in the English Church. Among other contributions to the literature may be mentioned (see above) Prof. *E. H. Plumptre's* Sermon at Oxford, in which he maintained that the condition of man was not necessarily final at his death, and pleaded for the use of prayers for the dead. Dr. *Farrar's* Sermons at Westminster Abbey, although apparently somewhat contradictory, in denying universalism, and yet teaching a doctrine which is not distinguishable from it, by their eloquence and popularity, gave a great impulse to the general study of the subject; while *A. Jukes*, in his Restitution of All Things, made a contribution of more solid and permanent value to the thoughtful consideration of the future of mankind in the light of Scripture and experience. By these controversies conventional notions have been much shaken. Another school is represented by *E. White* and his followers, who teach the annihilation of the wicked.]

(5) The Psychopannychia (sleep of souls) was advanced by *John Hcyn*, in a letter addressed to Baumgarten; see his Theologische Streitigkeiten, iii. s. 454, and probably also by *J. J. Wetstein* (see *Hagenbach* in Illgens Zeitschrift für historische Theologie, 1839, i. s. 118 f.), by *J. G. Sulzer* (Vermischte Schriften, 1781, ii. 1), and to some extent by *Reinhard*, Dogmatik, s. 656 (660) ff. The latter rejects, indeed, the full doctrine of a sleep of the soul, but admits that the soul, immediately after its separation from the body, falls into an unconscious state, because the change made by death is so powerful that the activity of the soul might for a time be interrupted by it. Comp. also *Simonetti*, Gedanken über die Lehre von der Unsterblichkeit und dem Schlaf der Seelen, Berl. 1747.—[*Isaac Taylor*, Physical Theory of another Life, and Abp. *Whately* on the Future State, 1855, advocate a condition of partial consciousness between death and resurrection.] Concerning the *migration of souls* (μετεμψύχωσις) in an ascending order, see *Schlosser*, Zwei Gespräche, Basel 1781. *Herder*, Zerstreute Blätter, Bd. i. s. 215. *F. Ehrenberg*, Wahrheit und Dichtung über unsere Fortdauer, Leipz. 1803. *Conz*, Schicksale der Seelenwanderungshypothese, Königsb. 1791. *Bretschneider*, Entw. s. 846 f. The doctrine of an *intermediate state* (Hades) was especially advocated by *Jung Stilling*, Geisterkunde, § 211, 212: "If the departed spirit, who has left this world in a state of imperfect holiness, carries along some elements which cannot be introduced into the heavenly regions, he must remain in *Hades* until he has put away all that is impure; but he does not suffer pain, excepting that of which he is himself the cause. The true sufferings in Hades are a kind of home-sick longing for the pleasures of this world for ever lost." Comp. his Apologie der Geisterkunde, s. 42, 55.—Among modern theologians, *Hahn* has adopted this view (Christ. Glaubensl. § 142; *Bretschneider*, Entw. s. 886). Passing by the theory of the intermediate state, *Priestley* endeavoured to reconcile the scriptural doctrine of resurrection with the philosophical idea of immortality, by supposing that there is a particular organ of the soul which developes itself in the hour of death; see British Magazine, 1773, vol. IV. Part II.; *Bretschneider*, s. 861.—*Swedenborg*, with peculiar hypotheses, developed his Eschatology; Bd. II.

s. 284. He rejected the Church doctrine of the resurrection, as founded upon a too literal interpretation of Scripture. (Resurrection and the judgment have already taken place.) Men continue to live as men (the righteous as angels) after their departure from this world, and are greatly surprised to find themselves in such a state. Immediately after death they again have a body, clothes, houses, etc., as in this world, and are ashamed of the erroneous opinions they had formed concerning the future life (comp. § 297). Those who were inclined towards the good and true dwell in magnificent palaces, surrounded by a paradise filled with trees. . . . The opposite takes place in the case of those who have indulged in sin. They are either in hell shut up in prisons without windows, in which there is light coming, as it were, from an ignis fatuus; or they live in deserts, and reside in huts, surrounded by sterile wastes, and haunted by serpents, dragons, owls, and other such objects corresponding to their evil inclinations. Between heaven and hell there is an *intermediate place* called the spirit-world. Every man goes to this immediately after death; the intercourse which there takes place between the departed spirits is similar to that which men carry on upon earth, etc. Divine Revelation, ii. s. 250, 251. By the new heaven and the new earth Swedenborg understood the new Church; see what he says on the Last Judgment, in his Divine Revelation, s. 263 ff.—*Oetinger's* original views on "The World of the Invisible and the Last Things," are found in his Theologie, s. 354 ff. (see *Auberlen*, s. 321 ff., 400 ff.). The Oxford Tractarians adopted, with some modifications, the doctrine of purgatory; see the work of *Weaver-Amthor*, s. 33 f.; and Tract 90, p. 25. Comp. *Delitzsch*, Bib. Psych. section vi.: Death and the Intermediate[1] State.

(6) *J. C. Lavater*, Aussichten in die Ewigkeit, in Briefe an Zimmermann, Zürich 1768 ff.—*Ch. F. Sintenis*, Elpizon, oder über meine Fortdauer im Tode, Danz. 1795 ff.—By the

[1] In close connection with the question respecting the intermediate state is the practical question, recently revived, how far prayers for the dead are admissible in the Reformed Churches. See *A. A. Leibbrand*, Das Gebet für die Todten, Stuttg. 1864 (affirmatively), and comp. *Stirm*, Darf man für die Verstorbenen beten? Jahrbb. für d. Theol. 1861, ii. s. 278 ff.

same: Oswald der Greis; mein letzter Glaube, Leipz. 1813. *Engel,* Wir werden uns wiedersehen, Gött. 1787, 1788. The literature is more fully given by *Bretschneider,* Entwicklung, s. 827, 879 ff.

(7) The arguments commonly advanced, especially in modern times, are the following:—1. The *metaphysical, i.e.* that which is derived from the nature of the soul; 2. The *teleological, i.e.* that which is derived from the capacities of man as not fully developed upon earth; 3. The *analogical, i.e.* that which is derived from nature — spring, the caterpillar, etc.; 4. The *cosmical, i.e.* the argument derived from the starry world; 5. The *theological, i.e.* the argument founded on the various attributes of God; 6. The *moral* (practical), *i.e.* the argument founded on the disparity in the struggle for happiness and for moral perfection. See *Kant,* Kritik der Praktischen Vernunft, s. 219 ff. For the literature, see *Bretschneider,* l.c., and *Hase,* Dogmatik, s. 111 f. *Strauss,* Dogmatik, ii. s. 697 ff.

(8) *Fichte,* Anweisung zum seligen Leben, s. 17: "*Most certainly* there is perfect happiness *also beyond* the grave for *those who have in this world begun to enjoy it,* and this is by no means different from that which we may here at any time begin to possess. We do not enter into this state of happiness merely by being buried. Many will seek happiness in the future life, and in the infinite series of future worlds, as much in vain as in the present life, if they think it can be found in anything but that which is now so near to them that it can never be brought nearer in the eternal." On the resurrection of the dead, comp. Vorl. 6, s. 178. *Schleiermacher,* Reden über Religion, R. 1, s. 172 (3d edit.), says that most men form their idea of immortality from irreligious motives, inasmuch as their wish to be immortal has its origin in their aversion to that which is the very end and aim of religion.

(9) *Schleiermacher,* Christl. Glaubensl. ii. § 157 ff. (Die prophetischen Lehrstücke, § 160 ff.). *De Wette,* Dogmatik, § 107 f.

(10) *F. Richter,* Die Lehre von den letzten Dingen, Bresl. 1833. By the *same:* Die Geheimlehren der neuern Philosophie, nebst Erklärung an Herrn Prof. Weisse in Leipzig, ibid. 1833.—By the *same:* Die neue Unsterblichkeitslehre, ibid. 1833. *Strauss,* Glaubenslehre, ii. s. 739: "The idea

of a future world . . . is the last enemy which speculative criticism has to oppose, and if possible (!) to overcome." The natural practical consequences of this doctrine are seen in Epicureanism, Communism, etc., although the speculative philosophy seeks to guard against these results.

(11) *Ch. Weisse,* Die philosophische Geheimlehre von der Unsterblichkeit des menschlichen Individuums, Dresd. 1834; and also, Ueber die philosophische Bedeutung der Lehre von den letzten Dingen, in the Theologische Studien und Kritiken, 1836, s. 271 ff. *J. H. Fichte,* Die Idee der Persönlichkeit und der individuellen Fortdauer, Elberf. 1834. *C. F. Göschel,* Von den Beweisen für die Unsterblichkeit der menschlichen Seele, im Lichte der speculativen Philosophie; eine Ostergabe, Berlin 1835. Comp. *Bretschneider,* s. 831. *Franz Baader* and others in the same controversy.—Theologically, the way has been prepared for an entire revision of the domain of eschatology, from the cosmological and anthropological as well as from the christological and soteriological points of view, in the doctrinal systems of *J. P. Lange,* ii. 2, s. 1227 ff.; *Rothe,* Theol. Ethik, ii. s. 156 ff.; *Liebner,* Christologie, i. 1; *Martensen,* s. 424 ff. (the completion of the Church); *Ebrard,* Dogmatik, ii. s. 719 ff. (the macrocosmic completion of all things).

(12) *Auberlen,* Der Prophet Daniel, und die Offenbarung Johannis, Basel 1854 [translated, Edinb. 1859], 2d edit. 1867, against Hengstenberg's transposition of the millennium into the Middle Ages—the so-called "Church period." *M. Baumgarten,* Die Nachtgesichte Sacharja's, Braunschweig 1853.

(13) This phenomenon is connected with the significance of the Revelation of John. The prevalent Church view (since Augustine), that the thousand years' reign falls into the time of the development of the Church, has still its defenders in the orthodox camp, peculiarly in *Hengstenberg,* who makes the millennium begin with Charles the Great, and last till 1848. Comp. his Offenbarung des h. Johannes, Berlin 1849 [English, Edinr.]. But it must be conceded, on the ground of an unprejudiced exegesis, that the millenarian expectations have their justification in the point of view of strict Biblical supernaturalism, however arbitrary, morbid, and fantastic many of the theosophic speculations and popular notions connected with it. [Comp. *Reuss,* Théologie Chrétienne, vol. II.] On

the conflicting opinions, in recent times, respecting the apocalyptic prophecies, and on the coming of Christ and the end of all things, compare the art. by *Ebrard*, "Offenbarung Johannes," in *Herzog's* Realenc. x. s. 574 ff., and that by *J. P. Lange*, "Wiederkunft Christi," ib. xviii. s. 126 ff. [Three views have been taken in England—(1) The præterist, according to which the millennium is past; (2) The futurist, according to which not only the second advent and the millennium (which follows it), but the manifestation of Antichrist and the events accompanying it, are still future; (3) The historical, according to which the advent of Christ is still future, and will be pre-millennial, but the manifestation of Antichrist has already taken place in the Papacy. To the first class belong *Stuart*, *Desprez*, and others; to the second, *Todd*, *Maitland*, *Alford*, and others; to the third, *Elliott* and others.]

(14) "*If the earth, by the spiritual force of Christianity, is changed, under the dominion of Christ, from a star in progress to a star in perfection, then its position in reference to the kingdom of perfection must be a fundamentally new one*" (*Lange*, l.c.).

INDEX.

A

AACHEN. *See* Councils.
Abbadie, iii. 32.
Abélard, ii. 108, 123.
  Works, 108, 123.
  On reason and revelation, 155.
  Scripture, 162.
  Tradition, 163.
  Being of God, 181.
  Attributes, 194.
  Omnipotence, 199, 202.
  Optimism, 203, 232.
  Trinity, 212.
  Theodicy, 232.
  Sin, 253.
  Hereditary sin, 259.
  Freedom, 259.
  Christology, 271.
  Right of the devil, 278, 283.
  Redemption, 283.
  Matrimony, 374.
אֲבִיוֹן, i. 68.
Abraham's bosom, ii. 393.
Absolute, Philosophy of, iii. 263.
Absolution as a sacrament, iii. 141. *See* Penance.
Abulfaradsh, ii. 113.
Acacius, i. 362.
Acceptilatio, iii. 212, 216.
Accidentia sine subjecto, ii. 345.
Accommodation, Theory of, iii. 315.
Acindynus, ii. 233.
Acominatus. *See* Nicetas Choniates.
Active obedience, iii. 209, 212, 218, 354, 355.
Acts of Councils, i. 29. *See* Councils.
Actus personales, iii. 185.
Adam, ii. 252. *See* Anthropology, Creation, Fall, Innocence.
Adam, Jean, iii. 65.
Adam Kadmon, i. 158.
עֲדַת יְהוָה, i. 272.
Addison, iii. 244.
Adelmann, ii. 341.
Adiaphoristic controversy, ii. 418.
Adminicula gratiæ, iii. 140.
Adoptianism, ii. 110, 267.
Adoratio, iii. 139.
Adoration. *See* Christ, Angels, Images, Mary, Worship.
Adrumetum, Monks of, i. 433.
Adso, ii. 380.
Advent, Second, i. 300, ii. 95, 385. *See* Eschatology.
Æneas of Paris, ii. 205.
Æneas Sylvius, ii. 109, 207.
Æons, i. 161.
Æpinus, iii. 207, 209.
Aërius, ii. 98.
Aëtius, i. 362.
Affectiones Scripturæ, iii. 63.
Affectus, ii. 309.
African school, ii. 113.
Agatho, i. 401.
ἀγεννησία, i. 375
Agnoëtæ, i. 398.
Agobard of Lyons, ii. 108, 116.
  Works, 108.
  On Jews, 108, 152.
  Inspiration, 166.
Agricola, ii. 418, iii. 67.
Agrippa of Nettersheim, ii. 252.
Aichard. *See* Eckard.
αἰώνιος, ii. 103.
αἵρεσις, i. 63.
Aix-la-Chapelle. *See* Councils.
Aktistetæ, i. 398.
Alanus of Ryssel (ab Insulis), ii. 127.
  On Faith, 156.
  Attributes of God, 194.
  Trinity, 217.
  Atonement, 286.
  Works, 310.
  Sacraments, 322.
  Matrimony, 377.

Albert the Great, ii. 129.
On knowledge of God, 184.
Erigena, 165.
Creation, 228.
Immaculate conception, 261, 264.
Christology, 271, 286.
Grace of sacraments, 329.
Concomitance, 356.
Matrimony, 375.
Albigenses, ii. 110.
Albinus. *See* Alcuin.
Albrecht, Meister, ii. 289.
Alcherus, ii. 241.
Alciat, iii. 20.
Alcuin, ii. 115.
On revelation, 163.
Procession of Holy Ghost, 206.
Adoptianism, 294, 338.
Alesius. *See* Alexander of Hales.
Alexander of Alexandria, i. 354.
Alexander of Constantinople, i. 354.
Alexander, Natalis, iii. 14.
Alexander of Hales, ii. 128.
On knowledge of God, 185.
Omnipresence, 195, 196.
Omniscience, 201.
Love of God, 204.
Trinity, 217.
Creation, 227.
Theodicy, 232.
Angels, 235.
Devil, 237.
Sinlessness of Mary, 263.
Redemption, 286.
Incarnation, 291.
Thesaurus meritorum, 311.
Seven sacraments, 323.
Lord's Supper, 350.
Chalice in Lord's Supper, 356.
Concomitance, 357.
Penance, 366.
Alexander III., ii. 270.
Alexander, W. L., iii. 293.
Alexander of Stourdza, iii. 305.
Alexandrian school, i. 94, 339.
Alexandrian culture, i. 59.
Alicubi, ii. 192.
Aliquando, ii. 192.
Allatius, Leo, iii. 15.
Allegorical interpretation, i. 124, 280, ii. 171, iii. 66.
Allgemeine Kirchl. Zeitschrift, iii. 281.
Allœosis, iii. 199.
Alogi, i. 76, 160, 239, iii. 176.
ἄλογος, ii. 211.
Alschwinus. *See* Alcuin.
Alsted, ii. 448, iii. 190.
Alting, ii. 448.
Alvarus Pelagius, ii. 264.
Amalarius of Metz, ii. 338, 339.
Amalrich of Bena, ii. 137.
On Pantheism, 190.
Redemption, 290.
The pope, 380.
Paradise, 398.
Amandus. *See* Suso.
Ambrose, i. 334.
On Trinity, 374.
Sin, 417.
Invocation of angels, ii. 43.
Redemption, 54.
Baptism and forgiveness, 74.
Eucharist, 82.
Change in elements (?), 82.
Future state, 98.
America, Theology in, iii. 282.
Ammon, iii. 247, 260, 307, 310, 376.
אָמוֹן, i. 156.
Amphilochius, i. 369.
Amsdorf, N., ii. 418, iii. 118.
Amularius (Amulo) of Lyons, ii. 144.
Amyraldism, ii. 456.
Amyraut (Amyraldus), ii. 454, 455, iii. 108.
Anabaptists, iii. 16, 50, 223, 380.
Church, 131.
ἀναγινωσκόμενα, ii. 12.
Analogia fidei, iii. 40.
Analytic method, ii. 424.
Anamartesia, i. 250.
Anastasius of Alexandria, i. 391.
Anastasius Sinaïta, i. 407.
Anatomy of will, i. 217. *See* Freedom.
Ancyra. *See* Councils.
Andreä, J., ii. 430.
Andreä, Val., ii. 430.
Andrews, Bishop, ii. 461.
Angelites, i. 380.
Angelolatry, i. 197, ii. 41.
Angelom, ii. 172.
Angels and angelology, i. 192, ii. 41, 233, iii. 193, 334.
Orders of, ii. 46.
Fall of, 47.
Part in judgment, 387.
Angelus Silesius. *See* Scheffler.
Anglican Church. *See* England.
Anglicana Confessio. *See* Thirty-nine Articles.

Anhalt, ii. 420.
Anna, Empress, ii. 233.
Annihilation, i. 320.
Annihilationists, iii. 385.
Anointing. *See* Unction.
Anselm, ii. 122.
On papal hierarchy, 148.
Evidences, 152.
Faith, 156.
Bible-reading, 174.
Ontological argument, 177.
Knowledge of God, 184.
Attributes of God, 193, 203.
Eternity and omnipresence, 194.
Omnipotence, 198.
Procession of Holy Ghost, 207.
Trinity, 212, 214, 218.
Creation, 232.
Angelology, 235.
Fall of devil, 237, 238.
Creatianism, 240.
Image of God, 248.
Sin, 252.
Imputation, 257.
Freedom, 249.
Sinlessness of Mary, 262.
Christology, 269, 271.
Birth of Virgin, 274.
Redemption, 277.
Cur Deus Homo, 278.
Soteriology, 278.
Election, 299.
Transubstantiation, 346, 351.
Atonement, iii. 209, 219, 354.
Anselm, Bp. of Havelberg, ii. 209.
Antecedent will, ii. 33, iii. 322.
Anthropology, i. 207, 324, 405.
Of Schoolmen, ii. 239.
Reformation, iii. 71.
Modern, 71, 338.
Anthropomorphism, i. 144, ii. 27.
Antichrist, i. 305, 378.
Antideistica, iii. 243.
ἀντιδόσεως τρόπος, ii. 266.
ἀντίδοσις, iii. 207.
ἀντιλεγόμενα, ii. 11.
Antinomian controversy, ii. 418, iii. 67.
Antinomians, ii. 458.
Antiochene school, i. 339, 386, ii. 14.
Antiochene symbol, i. 358.
Anti-Origenists, ii. 89.
Antipodes, ii. 231.
Antitrinitarians, i. 180, iii. 176. *See* Unitarians.
Ἀντίτυπα in Eucharist, ii. 79, 363.
Anti-Wolfians, iii. 234.
Apelles, Gnostic, i. 312.
Aphthartodocetæ, i. 398.
Apocalypse, i. 56, ii. 12, 13, 380, iii. 389.
Apocrypha, ii. 12, 13, iii. 45.
Apocryphal gospels, i. 113.
Apollinarianism, i. 386.
Apollinaris, i. 386, 407, ii. 61, 88.
Apollonius of Tyana, ii. 7.
Apologetics, i. 98, ii. 22, 108.
Ancient, ii. 4.
Mediæval, 108, 151, 175.
Modern, iii. 29.
Apology for Augsburg Confession. *See* Augsburg.
ἀπομνημονεύματα, i. 112.
Apostasy of demons, i. 202.
Apostles, i. 54.
Apostles' Creed, i. 61, 243, iii. 369.
Apostolate, New. *See* Irvingites.
Apostolical Constitutions, i. 82.
Apostolical Fathers, i. 79.
Apostolical succession. *See* Episcopacy.
Appetitus commodi and justi, ii. 252.
Appropriation of Christ's merits, ii. 61, 302.
Aquarii, i. 288.
Aquinas, Thomas, ii. 129.
On miracles, 152.
Contra Gentiles, 157.
Reason and revelation, 158.
Scripture, 162.
Tradition, 162.
Inspiration, 168, 169.
Interpretation, 173.
Ontological argument, 180.
Knowing God, 184.
Erigena, 188.
Attributes of God, 195.
Omniscience, 201.
Will of God, 203.
Procession of Holy Ghost, 209.
Creation, 227, 229.
Theodicy, 232, 233.
Angelology, 234.
Devil, 238.
Psychology, 240.
Immortality, 243.
Anima sensitiva and intellectiva, 243.
State of innocence, 246.
Pura naturalia, 247.
Image of God, 248.
The fall, 252.
Original justice, 259.
Immaculate conception, 264.

Aquinas, Thomas—
Sanctification of Mary, ii. 264.
Christology, 270.
Atonement, 286.
Three offices of Christ, 286.
Incarnation, 291.
Election, 301.
Justification, 303, 310.
Grace, 303, 304.
Faith, 310.
Indulgences, 311.
Hyperdulia, 319.
Idea of sacraments, 321, 327.
Number of sacraments, 323.
Indelible character, 328.
Mode of baptism, 332.
Baptismal grace, 332.
Confirmation, 335.
Transubstantiation, 349.
Sacrifice in Eucharist, 353.
Cup in Eucharist, 356, 357.
Concomitance, 356.
Penance, 366.
Extreme Unction, 370.
Orders, 371.
Matrimony, 374.
Apocalypse, 381.
Resurrection, 382, 384.
Judgment, 386.
Purgatory, 389.
Limbus Infantum, 394.
Beatitudo and dos, 399.
Hell, 402.
Arabian commentators, ii. 127.
Arabian heretics, i. 307, ii. 392.
Arabici, i. 222.
Archæology, i. 15.
Arch-heretic, i. 65.
ἀρχων, i. 161.
Aretius, ii. 447.
Argentinensis Confessio, ii. 437.
Arian controversy, i. 352.
Arianism, i. 342, 352.
Arians, i. 352 ff.
Aristæus, i. 116.
Aristotelianism, ii. 128, 242.
Aristotelians, ii. 128, 143.
Aristotle, ii. 128.
Arius, i. 352.
On Holy Spirit, 366.
His death, 358.
Arles. *See* Councils.
Arminianism, ii. 456, iii. 22.
On Scripture, 59.
Interpretation, 60.
State of innocence, 75.
Original sin, 83.
Arminianism—
Freedom, iii. 97.
Justification, 115.
The church, 126.
The sacraments, 143
Lord's Supper, 167.
Trinity, 181.
Creation, 190.
Baptism, 223.
Infant baptism, 225.
Arminians, iii. 22.
In England, ii. 457, iii. 288.
Learning of, iii. 23.
Arminius, iii. 23.
Arnauld, iii. 9, 171.
Arnd, ii. 428, iii. 64, 120.
Arnobius, i. 332.
On sin, 416.
Apology, ii. 4.
Miracles, 7.
Inspiration, 17.
Being of God, 23.
Nature of God, 33.
Eternity of God, 33.
Providence, 39.
Christology, i. 241.
Sinlessness of Christ, 250.
Annihilation, 320, ii. 103.
Arnold, ii. 429.
Arnold of Brescia, ii. 148.
Arnold, Dr. T., iii. 289, 291, 372.
Art, Mediæval, ii. 381.
Artemon, i. 161.
Articles of English Church, ii. 439.
42 Articles, 442.
39 Articles, 442.
Of Lambeth, 459.
Articles of Remonstrants, iii. 22.
Articles of Schmalkalden, ii. 417.
Articles of Torgau, ii. 416.
ἀρτοκλασία, iii. 169.
ἄρτος, ii. 363.
Artotyrites, i. 288.
Ascension-body. *See* Resurrection.
Asceticism, i. 411.
Lutheran, ii. 426.
עשׂה, iii. 153.
Ascusnages, John, i. 379.
Assembly, Westminster, ii. 445, 457.
Assurance, ii. 304, iii. 107.
Asterius, i. 363.
Athanasian Creed, i. 357, 381, iii. 69, 178.
Athanasius, i. 327.
Works, 327.
On Dionysius, 347.

Athanasius—
Arianism, i. 353, 362.
Holy Spirit, 368.
Trinity, 376.
Procession of Holy Spirit, 381.
Christ's humanity, 385.
Apollinaris, 386, 388.
Traducianism, 407.
Soul, 409.
Sin, 411, 415.
Defence of Christianity, ii. 4.
Bible, 9.
Canon, 12.
Being of God, 23.
Nature of God, 28.
Dualism, 30, 41.
Attributes, 33.
Creation, 35, 37.
Redemption, 52, 58.
Baptism, 75.
Lord's Supper, 83.
Atheism, iii. 323.
Athenagoras, i. 87.
On unity of God, 139.
Logos, 164.
Holy Spirit, 175.
Creation, 186.
Providence, 192.
Angels, 194.
Demons, 199.
Freedom, 218.
Fall, 234.
Resurrection, 307, 308.
Atonement. *See* Redemption.
ἄτοπα, ii. 11.
Attalus, i. 141.
Attributes of God, i. 149, ii. 31, 192, 203. *See* God.
Attritio, i. 265, ii. 367.
Auberlen, iii. 389.
αὔχημα, iii. 207.
Auchterarder case, iii. 293.
Audæus, i. 410.
Audians, ii. 27.
Auditio, iii. 120.
Auditores, ii. 63.
Aufklärung, iii. 241.
Augsburg apology, ii. 415, 417.
On original righteousness, iii. 174.
Justification, 112.
Faith and love, 114.
Church, 126.
Invocation of saints, 138.
Sacraments, 142.
Opus operatum, 144.
Mass, 152.
Penance, 172.
Augsburg—
Trinity, iii. 178.
Incarnation, 199.
Atonement, 211.
Augsburg Confession, ii. 416.
Variata, 416.
On original sin, iii. 81.
Freedom, 100.
Justification, 113.
Faith, 113.
Good works, 114.
Church, 126, 127.
Mass, 128.
Saints, 137.
Number of sacraments, 142.
Word and sacraments, 143.
Ex opere operato, 144.
Lord's Supper, 151.
Cup, 153.
Real presence, 160.
Penance, 172.
Trinity, 178.
Incarnation, 199.
Eschatology, 227.
Restitution of all things, 228.
Eternal punishment, 228.
Augusti, iii. 298.
On the devil, ii. 236.
Sacraments, iii. 376.
Augustine, i. 334.
On procession of Holy Spirit, 373.
Trinity, 376.
Christ's body, 399.
Origin of soul, 406.
Soul and body, 409.
Freedom, 411, 418, 427.
Sin, 411.
Fall, 413.
Conscience, 423.
Original sin, 423.
Pelagianism, 419, 424.
Predestination, 430.
Semi-Pelagianism, 435.
Religion, ii. 2.
Revelation, 3.
De Civitate Dei, 4.
Miracles, 6.
Tradition, 8.
Bible, 9.
Apocrypha, 13.
Inspiration, 15.
Interpretation, 18.
Councils, 21.
Physico-theological argument, 23.
Ontological argument, 24.
Nature of God, 28, 30.
Attributes of God, 32, 33.

Augustine—
Creation, ii. 35.
Six days, 35.
Trinity in creation, 36.
Preservation, 38.
Evil, 41.
Angels, 38, 43, 45, 47.
Worship of angels, 44.
Fall of angels, 47, 48.
Conversion of devil, 51.
Redemption, 58, 60.
Extent of, 59, 61.
The church, 64.
Visible and invisible church, 64.
Heretics, 66.
Sacraments, 67.
Baptism, 71.
Unbaptized children, 74.
Eucharist, 84, 85.
Chiliasm, 88.
Resurrection, 90, 92.
Judgment, 95.
Purgatory, 95, 96.
Prayers for dead, 98.
Intermediate state, 99.
Heaven, 99, 100.
Future punishment, 102, 103, 104.
Degrees of happiness and suffering, 104.
Invocation of saints, iii. 138.
Augustinianism, i. 340, 429, 433, 436, ii. 300 ff., iii. 8 ff.
Augustus, Elector, ii. 419.
Aureolæ, ii. 396.
Auricular confession, ii. 367, iii. 172.
αὐτεξούσιον, i. 217.
αὐθεντία, iii. 62.
αὐτόθεος, i. 350, 379.
Averrhoes, ii. 128.
Avicebron, ii. 128.
Avicenna, ii. 128.
Avitus of Vienne, i. 432.
ἀξιοπιστία, iii. 62.
Azymites, ii. 363.

B

Baader, F., iii. 302.
Bacon, F., iii. 33.
Bacon, R., ii. 142, 381.
Baden disputation, ii. 432.
Bahrdt, iii. 241, 248.
Baier, ii. 425, iii. 27, 184.
Baillie, R., ii. 460.
Bajus, iii. 9, 110.
Balaamites, i. 65.
Baptism, i. 277, ii. 69, 320, iii. 219, 375.
Baptism—
Before Christ, i. 279.
Infant, 277, 281, 282, ii. 72, 331, 332.
In name of Christ, i. 278.
Delay of, 283, ii. 72.
Grace of, i. 279.
Of heretics, 283, 284, 285, ii. 75.
Of laymen, i. 283.
Of blood and martyrdom, 285, ii. 71, 72, 382.
Of tears, 72.
And original sin, 73.
And faith, 75.
Repetition of, 334.
Sins before and after, 365.
Roman mode, i. 283, ii. 382.
Nature and necessity, 71, 74, 334.
Protestant view, iii. 220.
Repetition, iii. 225.
Minister, 226.
βάπτισμα, i. 278.
Baptismal regeneration, i. 279.
Baptismus clinicorum, i. 283.
Baptists, Confession of, ii. 445.
Bar Sudaili, ii. 88.
Barclay, R., iii. 26.
On Scripture, 52.
On the church, 131.
Bardesanes, i. 190.
Barhebræus (Abulfaradsh), ii. 113.
Bari. *See* Councils.
Barlaam, ii. 233.
Barnabas, i. 80.
His epistle, 80.
On prophecy, 101.
Redemption, 101, 255.
Interpretation, 124.
Demons, 201.
Baptism, 279.
Chiliasm, 303.
Baroe, ii. 459.
Barret, ii. 459.
Barrow, I., ii. 462.
Barthels, iii. 245.
Basedow, iii. 241.
Basel. *See* Councils.
Basel, iii. 282.
Confessions—
First, ii. 437.
Second, 437, 438.
On Scripture, iii. 43, 45.
Authority of creeds, 70.
Original righteousness, 74.
Original sin, 81.
Immaculate conception, 87.

Basel—
Predestination and election, 102, 105.
Faith, 114.
Church, 126.
Discipline, 134.
Number of sacraments, 142.
Lord's Supper, 161.
Trinity, 178.
Basil of Ancyra, i. 361.
Basil the Great, i. 328.
On the Holy Spirit, 369.
Procession of Holy Spirit, 372.
Trinity, 375.
Sin, 412, 415.
Inspiration, ii. 17.
Church authority, 21.
Nature of God, 27.
Angels, 42, 45.
Redemption, 61.
Baptism, 70.
Baptism of heretics, 75.
Eucharistic sacrifice, 86.
Resurrection, 90.
End of world, 94, 96.
Heaven, 100.
Basilides, i. 243.
Basilidians, i. 228.
Basnage, iii. 7.
Baumgarten, M., iii. 389.
Baumgarten, S. J., i. 37, iii. 236, 256, 325.
Baumgarten-Crusius, iii. 247.
On reformation, ii. 407.
Roman church, iii. 13.
Socinus, 21.
Baur, F. C., iii. 277.
Works, i. 1.
On Beryllus, i. 181.
Angelology, 194.
Gnostic fate, 220.
Gnostics, 243.
Redemption, 253.
Athanasius, 327.
Augustine, 336, ii. 65, 68.
Arius, i. 354.
Nicene Creed, 357.
Marcellus, 365.
Philoponus, 380.
Eunomius, 385.
Monothelites, 402.
Pelagius, 429.
Augustinians, 436.
The Predestinatus, 433.
Cassian, 434.
Apologetics, ii. 5.
Tradition, 22.
Baur, F. C.—
Ontological argument, ii. 26.
Nature of God, 27.
Manichæans, 36, 63.
Gregory of Nyssa, 54.
Theory of atonement, 59.
The church, 65.
Patristic theories of Eucharist, 79.
Scholasticism, 109, 120, 126, 134.
Abélard, 124.
Peter Lombard, 126.
Aquinas and Scotus, 130.
Scotus, 134.
Mysticism, 135.
Anselm, 157.
Aquinas, 152, 158.
Abélard and Aquinas on tradition, 162.
Origen, 170.
Anselm's argument for being of God, 179.
David of Dinanto, 190.
Scholastic Trinity, 226.
Aquinas on creation, 228.
Erigena, 274.
Aquinas' Christology, 271.
Anselm, 277, 283.
Anselm and Abélard, 284.
Aquinas on sacraments, 349.
Catholicism and Protestantism, 408.
Lutheranism and Calvinism, 410.
Sebastian Frank, 427.
Schwenkfeld, 427.
Calvinism, 433.
Catholic and Protestant doctrine of atonement, iii. 211.
Active and passive obedience, 212.
Socinian Christology, 215.
Grotius, 217.
English Deism, 238.
Pietism, 253.
Schleiermacher, 270.
Modern German theology, 299.
Bautain, iii. 303.
Baxter, R., ii. 464, iii. 31.
Bay, De. *See* Bajus.
Bayle on Keckermann, iii. 31.
On Bellarmine, 5.
Beatitudo and dos, ii. 399.
Beatus, ii. 270.
Becanus, iii. 7.
Beck, J. C., iii. 236, 310.
Beck, J. T., iii. 273.
Bede, ii. 115.

Bede—
On predestination, ii. 294.
Lord's Supper, 338.
Extreme Unction, 368.
βιελζεβούλ, i. 198.
Beghards, ii. 110.
Christology, 274.
On redemption, 290.
Hell, 404.
Beguines, ii. 110, 164, 383.
Behmen. *See* Böhm.
Being of God, i. 133, ii. 22, 175, iii. 183, 324.
Bekker, ii. 454.
On reason and scripture, iii. 6.
Devil and demons, 195, 334.
Belgic Confession, ii. 437, iii. 44.
Original sin, 82.
The church, 126.
Bellarmine, iii. 5.
On interpretation, 46.
Inspiration, 65.
Original righteousness, 72.
Creatianism, 89.
Freedom and grace, 96.
Predestination, 97.
Justification, 113.
The church militant, 125.
The church a state, 134.
Sacrifice of mass, 153.
Satisfaction, 211, 212.
Belsham, iii. 288.
Bena. *See* Amalrich.
Benedict XII. on sleep of soul, ii. 392.
Bengel, iii. 246, 250, 256.
On prophecy, 320.
Zinzendorf, 329, 354, 366.
Pelagianism, 365.
Eschatology, 383.
Bennett case, iii. 381.
Bentley, R., iii. 35.
Berengarius, ii. 110.
Sacraments, ii. 321.
Lord's Supper, 341.
Bergen Book, ii. 420.
Berington, iii. 304.
Berkeley, iii. 244.
Bern, ii. 432, iii. 283.
Bern disputation, ii. 432.
Bernard of Clairvaux, ii. 136.
On orthodoxy, 148.
Faith, 156.
Internal revelation, 159.
Scripture, 164.
Interpretation, 164, 172.
Omnipresence, 196.
Immaculate conception, 263.
Bernard of Clairvaux—
Atonement, ii. 284.
The two swords, 313.
Worship of Mary, 318.
Feet-washing, 321.
Baptism, 334.
Beron, i. 182.
Berthold—
On reason, ii. 160.
Revelation, 164.
Creation, 228, 230.
Angels, 236.
Creatianism, 241.
Image of God, 248.
Penny-preachers, 311.
Papacy, 313.
Sacraments, 324.
Baptism, 332.
Purgatory, 391.
Limbus infantum, 394.
Bertram. *See* Ratramnus.
Beryllus, i. 77, 180.
Beveridge, ii. 463.
Beyschlag, iii. 352.
Beza (de Bèze), ii. 447.
Supralapsarian, iii. 103.
Bible, i. 109, 114, 123, ii. 8, 161, iii. 41, 42, 43, 143, 312.
In general use, i. 122.
Reading of, ii. 170.
Luther's, 414.
Cranmer's, 458.
See Canon, Inspiration, Interpretation, Scripture.
Bible societies, ii. 273.
Bible and tradition, i. 127, ii. 8, iii. 40, 67. *See* Tradition.
Biblia Pauperum, ii. 174.
Biblical criticism, iii. 13, 48.
Biblical learning, iii. 48.
Roman Catholic, iii. 13.
Biblical theology, i. 6.
Bibliolatry, iii. 249.
Bibliotheca Fratrum Polonorum, iii. 21.
On the Trinity, iii. 181.
Bickersteth, E.—
On Edwards, iii. 295.
Biel, Gabriel, ii. 133.
Ex opere operato, 328.
Marriage, 375.
Billroth, iii. 277, 317.
Bingham, iii. 132.
Bircherod, ii. 423.
Biscop. *See* Episcopius.
Bishops, i. 275, 276.
Blandrata, iii. 20.

Blasche, iii. 266, 311, 333, 341, 348.
Blase, iii. 301.
Bleek, iii. 321.
Blessed, State of. *See* Heaven.
Blessing, iii. 284.
Blondel, iii. 109.
Blood. *See* Baptism.
Blood of Christ. *See* Lord's Supper, Redemption.
Blood-theology, iii. 255.
Blount, iii. 31, 34.
Bluttheologie, iii. 255.
Bockhold, iii. 17.
Bodin, iii. 31.
Body, Risen, of Christ, i. 249.
Body and soul. *See* Anthropology.
Boëthius (pseudo-Boethius), i. 337, ii. 119.
On Trinity, i. 378.
Ontological argument, ii. 25.
Nature of God, 28.
Bogomiles, ii. 110, 332, 382.
Bohemian Brethren, ii. 313.
Confession, 445.
Böhm (or Böhme), ii. 428.
On inspiration, iii. 63.
Justification, 119.
State church, 137.
Trinity, 186.
Creation, 191.
Christology, 205.
Böhmer, iii. 323, 371.
Bolingbroke, iii. 238.
Bolsec, iii. 108.
Bona, iii. 12.
Bonaventura, John, of Fidanza, ii. 131, 136.
Works, 131.
On reading Bible, 174.
Omnipresence of God, 195.
Omniscience, 201.
Eternity, 196.
Angelology, 235.
Psychology, 241.
Immortality, 244.
Sin of Adam, 252.
Immaculate Conception, 264.
Atonement, 286.
Election, 301.
Grace, 305.
Worship of Mary, 317.
Sacraments, 320, 323.
Confirmation, 335.
Lord's Supper, 350.
Cup, 356, 357.
Penance, 367.
Marriage, 376.
Bonaventura—
Purgatory, ii. 389.
Boni homines, ii. 110.
Boniface II., i. 433.
Boniface VIII., ii. 314, 336.
Bonnet on Miracles, iii. 318.
Boos, M., iii. 301.
Booth, A., iii. 368.
Borhaus. *See* Cellarius
Borromeo, Carlo, iii. 11.
Bose, Du, iii. 109.
Bossuet, iii. 7, 11, 28.
On Bishop Bull, ii. 462.
On union, iii. 28.
Worship of saints, 139.
Transubstantiation, 171.
Purgatory, 174.
Bost, iii. 285.
Bourignon, ii. 452.
Bouterweck, iii. 277.
Bouvières de Mothe-Guyon. *See* Guyon.
Boyle, R., iii. 31, 34.
Bradwardine, Thomas of, ii. 301.
Brahmanism, i. 155.
Bramhall, Bishop, ii. 462.
Brandenburg Confession. *See* Confession of Sigismund.
Braun, ii. 451.
Bread. *See* Lord's Supper.
Breaking of bread. *See* Lord's Supper.
Breckling, ii. 429.
Bremen Church Controversy, iii. 280.
Brenz—
On the Canon, iii. 57.
On Œcolampadius, 157.
Brès, Guido de, ii. 443.
Bretschneider, iii. 263.
Brett, iii. 132.
Breviarium Romanum, iii. 3.
Bridget, Saint, ii. 169, 264.
British Magazine, iii. 284.
Broad Church School, iii. 291.
Brochmand, ii. 423.
Brogden, iii. 133.
Bromley, T., ii. 452.
Brothers of the common life, ii. 174.
Brown, John, iii. 293.
Browne, Bishop, iii. 36.
Bruch, iii. 284, 327.
Bruno, Euseb., ii. 347.
Bruno, iii. 30.
Bucanus, ii. 447.
On Adam's innocence, iii. 75.
Creatianism, 90.
Bucer, ii. 438, 446, iii. 28.

Bucer—
In England, ii. 460.
On Lord's Supper, iii. 161, 162.
Büchner, iii. 324.
Buckland, iii. 332.
Buddeus, iii. 235.
On König, ii. 425.
Bugenhagen, ii. 416.
Bugri, ii. 110.
Bull, Bp. G., ii. 461, iii. 22, 117, 182.
Bullarium, i. 30.
Bullinger, H., ii. 446.
Confession of, ii. 437, 438.
Bunsen, iii. 280.
Bunyan, ii. 464.
Burgess, Bishop, iii. 288.
Burkhardt on Spangenberg, iii. 256.
Burlamacchi, ii. 146.
Burrmann, ii. 450.
Burnet, Bishop G., ii. 463.
On Sarpi, iii. 1.
On foreign orders, iii. 132.
Burnet, T., iii. 175.
Burning of world, i. 312. *See* Eschatology.
Burton, E., on Gnostics, i. 315.
Bushnell, H., iii. 297.
Butler, Alban, iii. 304.
Butler, Charles, iii. 304.
Butler, Bishop Joseph, iii. 35, 244, 288.

C

Cabasilas. *See* Nicolas.
Cæcilian, ii. 63.
Cæcilius, i. 190.
Cælestine. *See* Celestine.
Cælestius. *See* Pelagius.
Cæsarius of Arles, ii. 97.
Cæsarius of Heisterbach, ii. 190, 380.
Cæsaropapacy, iii. 134.
Cainians, i. 285.
Caius, i. 302, 305.
Cajetan, iii. 4, 145.
Calixt, ii. 423, 430, iii. 28.
On inspiration, 61.
Tradition, 68, 69.
Justitia Originalis, 77.
Sin, 92.
Creatianism, 92.
Justification, 118, 119.
Ubiquity, 160.
Trinity, 188.
Calixtines, ii. 146.
Calov, ii. 424, iii. 69.
Original righteousness, 74.
Pre-Adamites, 88.
Calov—
Traducianism, iii. 89.
Creation, 190.
Calvin, ii. 434.
Institutes, 434.
Works, 435.
Influence, 439.
Consensus Genevensis, 440.
Catechism of Geneva, 444.
On Scripture, iii. 42.
Inspiration, 59.
Original righteousness, 73.
Original sin, 80.
Creatianism, 89.
Predestination, 103.
Castellio and Bolsec, 108.
Justification, 113.
Church, 126, 127.
Priesthood, 129.
Excommunication, 134.
Sacraments, 147.
Mass, 152.
Lord's Supper, 162.
Westphal, 164.
Zwingli, 164.
Charged with Arianism, 177.
On Trinity, 178.
Nature of creation, 189.
Satan, 194.
Angels, 194.
Person of Christ, 199.
Atonement, 213.
Obedience of Christ, 219.
Osiander, 219.
Baptism and original sin, 222.
Psychopannychy, 227.
Calvinism—
Its peculiarity, ii. 432.
Symbolical books, 436, 437.
Theology, 444.
On decrees, iii. 95.
The church, 126.
Calvinism and Lutheranism, ii. 408, 419, 431 ff.
Attempts at union, iii. 27, 36.
On decrees, 95.
Faith, 116.
Economy of salvation, 120.
Worship, 123.
Ordination, 129.
Lord's Supper, 156.
Christology, 199.
Christ's humiliation, 206.
Baptism, 220.
Calvinism in England, ii. 456 ff., iii. 288.
In America, iii. 294.

Calvinistic reformation, ii. 431.
Cameron, John, ii. 455.
On atonement, 218.
Campanella, iii. 30.
Campanus, J., iii. 20, 180.
Campanus, W., iii. 180.
Campbell, M'Leod, iii. 362.
Campe, iii. 241.
Campen, Von. *See* Pighius.
Candlish, iii. 318.
Canisius, iii. 3, 6.
Cannæ Eucharisticæ, ii. 356.
Canon, i. 110, ii. 7, 10, 165.
Canon law, ii. 312.
Canones Thoranienses, ii. 445.
Canonization, ii. 318.
Canons of Trent, iii. 1.
Canons, Apostolical, i. 82.
Canus, iii. 7.
Canz, iii. 236.
Capadose, iii. 283.
Capellus, ii. 454.
Capernaitic interpretation, ii. 84, 337, 344.
Capito, ii. 446.
On Lord's Supper, iii. 162.
Capnio. *See* Reuchlin.
Carlstadt, ii. 427.
On Lord's Supper, iii. 153.
Scripture, iii. 49, 57.
Criticism, 57.
Caroli, iii. 177.
Carolingian age, ii. 114.
Carpocrates, i. 73.
Carpov, iii. 236.
Carpzov, iii. 256.
Cartesian philosophy, ii. 453, iii. 30.
Cartesius. *See* Descartes.
Carthage, i. 340. *See* Councils.
Cartwright, ii. 459.
Cassian, J., i. 336, 406, 432, 434, ii. 52.
Cassiodorus, ii. 101, 119.
Castellio, iii. 108.
Cataphrygians, i. 76.
Catechism—
Calvin's, ii. 457.
Canisius', iii. 3.
Cranmer's, ii. 458.
Geneva, 439, 444.
Heidelberg, 440.
Of Leo Judä, iii. 146.
Luther's, ii. 415, 418.
Of Moscorovius, iii. 21.
Poinet's, ii. 442.
Racovian, iii. 47.
Roman, 1, 3.
Catechism—
Of Schmalz, iii. 21.
Of Schomann, 21.
Of Socinus, 21.
Westminster, ii. 445.
Church of England, 442.
Catechisms, i. 30.
Cathari, ii. 110, 324, 333, 382.
On Purgatory, 388.
Catharine, Saint, of Siena, ii. 264.
Catharinus, iii. 4.
Catholic Doctrine, i. 77.
Catholics, union with Protestants, iii. 27.
Cattenburg, iii. 25.
Causa meritoria, instrumentalis, iii. 218.
Cave, iii. 138.
Celestine of Rome, i. 392, 437.
Celibacy, ii. 147, 374.
Cellarius, iii. 17.
Celsus, i. 191, 240.
Cerdano, iii. 30.
Cerdo, i. 73.
Ceremonies, iii. 137.
Cerinthus, i. 66, 303.
Certitudo salutis, iii. 107.
Cerularius, ii. 363.
Chalcedon, Council, i. 393.
Chaldee Christians, i. 393.
Chalice. *See* Lord's Supper.
Challoner, iii. 304.
Chalmers, Dr. T., iii. 293.
Chamier, ii. 447.
Champeaux. *See* William.
Chandieu, ii. 441.
Channing, W. E., iii. 285, 296.
Chantepie de la Saussage, iii. 285.
Character hypostaticus, iii. 185.
Character indelibilis, ii. 328, 371, 373, iii. 129.
Charlemagne (Charles the Great), ii. 121, 205, 338.
Charles the Bald, ii. 296, 338.
Charles II. (England), ii. 457.
Charles V., ii. 417, 437.
Charnock, ii. 457.
Charron, iii. 31.
Chateaubriand, iii. 303.
Chatel, iii. 303.
Cheese in Lord's Supper. *See* Artotyrites.
χειροτονία, ii. 371.
Chemnitz, ii. 421.
Chénevière, iii. 285.
Children, Communion of, ii. 85, 364.
Faith in, iii. 221.

Chiliasm. *See* Millenarianism.
Chillingworth, ii. 454, 466.
חָכְמָה, i. 156.
χοϊκοί, i. 208.
Choniates. *See* Nicetas.
χρίσμα, ii. 335, 369.
Christ, Life of—
Works on, i. 49 f.
God-man, 239, 243.
Glorified body, 249, 399.
Sinlessness, 250.
Redemption by, 252.
Human nature, 383.
Two persons, 389.
Two wills, 400.
Union of soul and body in death, ii. 275.
Adoration of, iii. 347.
Ideal and historical, ii. 268, iii. 344, 346, 348. *See* Christology, Natures, Will, God-man, Hypostasis, Soteriology, Redemption, Advent, Monothelite, Trinity, etc.
Christian II., Elector, ii. 422.
Christianity in general, i. 49 ff., 197 ff., ii. 4, 106, 151, iii. 309.
State religion, ii. 87.
Christolatry, iii. 249.
Christology, i. 134, 237, 324, 344, 383, ii. 266, iii. 197, 343.
In relation to theology and anthropology, i. 237.
Chrysostom, i. 329.
On Arian controversy, 361.
Christ's body, 399.
Sin, 416.
Augustinianism, 432.
Scripture, ii. 10, 13, 18.
Inspiration, 15, 16.
Providence, 34, 38.
Atonement, 61.
Baptism, 73.
Lord's Supper, 81, 83, 86.
Resurrection, 90.
Heaven, 101.
Future punishment, 102, 104.
Chubb, iii. 31.
Church, i. 271, ii. 62, 312, iii. 123, 369.
Church militant, iii. 124.
Organization, 134.
Representation, 135.
Visible and invisible, ii. 65, iii. 135.
Universal and particular, iii. 135.
See Bishop, Priest, Pope, Presbyterian, Clergy, Sacraments, England, Greek, Latin, Western, Ecclesia, etc.
Church Catechism, ii. 442.
On Baptism, iii. 225.
Church history, Works on, i. 41.
Tables of, i. 43.
Church and State, ii. 312, iii. 134.
Churches dedicated to angels, ii. 42.
Chytræus, ii. 420.
Clairvoyance, iii. 334.
Clarendon, Lord, iii. 34.
Clarisse, iii. 283.
Clarke, S., ii. 459, 466, iii. 22, 35, iii. 182, 244, 283, 328.
Classical studies, ii. 142.
Claude, iii. 109.
On Eucharist, iii. 171.
Claudius of Savoy, iii. 20.
Claudius of Turin, ii. 114, 116.
Clausen, iii. 282.
Clémangis. *See* Nicolas.
Clement of Alexandria, i. 92.
Works, 92.
On Inspiration, 118.
Interpretation, 124.
Tradition, 129, 130.
Being of God, 135, 137.
Unity of God, 140.
Names of God, 142.
Anthropomorphism, 145.
Attributes of God, 150, 151.
Justice of God, 153.
Logos, 164.
Creation, 187.
Providence, 189, 191.
Angels, 194.
Devil, 205.
Anthropology, 207, 209, 212.
Image of God, 215, 216.
Freedom, 219.
Sin, 225, 420.
Fall, 227, 228, 233.
Christology, 245, 246.
Sinlessness of Christ, 250.
Redemption, 257, 262, 265.
Hades, 264.
Faith, 268.
Grace, 269.
Predestination, 269.
The church, 273, 274.
Baptism, 265, 279, 283.
Infant baptism, 282.
Lord's Supper, 293.
Resurrection, 310.
Intermediate state, 315.
Heaven, 317.

Clement of Alexandria—
On Hell, i. 320.
Clement of Rome, i. 81.
On redemption, 255.
Justification, 268.
Eschatology, 303.
Resurrection, 307.
Future state, 319.
Clement IV., ii. 359.
Clement, V., ii. 331, 346.
Clement VIII., iii. 110.
Clementine Homilies, i. 70, 99.
On demons, 200.
Image of God, 215.
The fall, 229.
Baptism, 279.
Chiliasm, 302.
Clergy, ii. 371, iii. 123.
Clericus (Le Clerc), iii. 25.
Cobham, Lewis, ii. 381.
Cocceius, ii. 450.
Interpretation, iii. 66.
Cochlæus, iii. 4.
Cognitio, ii. 309.
Colani, iii. 285.
Colenso, iii. 285.
Coleridge, S. T., iii. 288, 289, 318, 372.
On Bishop Taylor, ii. 462.
Collegia Biblica, iii. 65.
Collegial system, iii. 369.
Collegium Trinitatis, iii. 207.
Collenbusch, iii. 361.
Collins, iii. 31, 34.
Colloquium Charitativum, iii. 28.
Colloquium Lipsiacum, ii. 445, iii. 28.
Colloquy of Marburg. *See* Marburg.
Cöln, ii. 149.
Colorbasus-Gnosis, i. 162.
Combe, François la, iii. 13.
Comenius, ii. 452.
Common Prayer Book, ii. 442.
Common-sense philosophy, iii. 29.
Communicatio Idiomatum, iii. 199, 206.
Communion, Holy. *See* Lord's Supper.
Communion of children. *See* Children.
Communion of sick, iii. 169.
Comprehensibility of God, ii. 26, 183.
Conceptio Immaculata. *See* Mary.
Concomitance, ii. 346, 356.
Concordia. *See* Formula.
Concordienbuch. *See* Liber Concordiæ.
Concordienformel. *See* Formula Concordiæ.
Concupiscentia, i. 235, ii. 71, 331.
Concursus Dei, i. 191, iii. 193.
Condemned, State of. *See* Hell.
Condillac, iii. 238.
Confessio oris, ii. 365.
Confession—
To laymen, ii. 367.
Auricular, ii. 367, iii. 172.
Confessions, Conflicts of, iii. 297.
Confessions of Faith. *See* Symbolism.
Anglican, ii. 439, 442.
Augsburg, 415, 416.
Apology for, 417.
Baptist, 445.
Basel (First), 437.
Basel (Second), 437, 438 (First Helvetic).
Belgian, 437, 439, 443.
Bohemian, 445.
Brandenburg, 439, 443.
Of Cyril Lucar, iii. 15.
Of Damascus, ii. 69.
Of Dort, 439, 444.
Of Episcopius, iii. 23.
Eusebian, i. 358.
Gallic, ii. 439, 441.
Geneva, 439, 444.
Greek Church. *See* Greek.
Helvetic, First (Second of Basel) *See* Basel.
Helvetic, Second, ii. 437, 441.
Hungarian (Czengerina), 439, 443.
Marchica, 439, 443.
Mennonites, iii. 17.
Mülhusana, ii. 437.
Polish, 445.
Reformed, 445.
Remonstrants, iii. 23.
Savoy, ii. 445.
Scotch, 439, 443.
Sigismundi, 439, 443.
Tetrapolitana (Argentinensis, Suevica), 437.
Thorn, 439.
Westminster, 445.
Würtemberg, iii. 194.
Confessors, Intercessions of, i. 267.
Confirmation, ii. 69, 329, 334, iii. 172.
Conflagration of world, i. 313, ii. 94.
Confutation of Augsburg Confession, ii. 415, 417.
Confutatio of 1550, iii. 100.
Congregationalism, Works on, iii. 134.
Congregationes de Auxiliis, iii. 108.
Cononites, ii. 93.
Conrad, iii. 20.

Conradi, iii. 349.
Conscience, Appeal to, iii. 307.
Consecration, Formulas of, ii. 79, 371.
Consensus of Church, iii. 68.
Consensus Dresdensis, ii. 419.
  Genevensis, 439.
  Genevensis in England, 460.
  Sendomirensis, 439.
  Tigurinus, 439.
Consensusformel. *See* Formula.
Consensus Repetitus—
  On Inspiration, iii. 61.
  The church, 69.
  Traducianism, 89, 94.
  Breaking the bread, 169.
  Trinity, 185.
  Trinity in Old Testament, 188.
Consequent will, ii. 233.
Conservatives, iii. 232.
Constance. *See* Councils.
Constant, iii. 284.
Constantine, i. 358, ii. 21, 44.
Constantine Monomachus, ii. 363.
Constantine Pogonatus, i. 401.
Constantinople (Council)—
  Second General, i. 357.
  Creed of, 359.
  Council of 680, 401.
  Council of 754, ii. 364.
Constantius, i. 358.
Constitutions. *See* Apostolical.
Consubstantialis, i. 381.
Consubstantiality of sin, i. 348.
Consubstantiation, ii. 362, iii. 149, 165.
Contingence of sin, iii. 92.
Contingency, Argument from, ii. 175.
Contritio, i. 265, ii. 365, 367.
Conversio, i. 265, ii. 365, iii. 120, 172.
Cooper, A., iii. 31.
Co-operation, ii. 303, iii. 96.
Coornheit, iii. 82.
Copts, i. 342.
Coquérel, iii. 286.
Coracion, ii. 87.
Corinth, Church of, i. 64.
Corona aurea, ii. 396.
Corporeity of God, i. 144.
Corpus Christi day, ii. 346, 352.
Correspondences, iii. 321.
Cosin, Bp., ii. 462, iii. 132.
Cosmological argument, ii. 23, 175, iii. 325.
Cosmology, ii. 289.
Coster, iii. 7.
Cotton, John, iii. 134.
Councils. *See* Synods.
  Aachen (Aix-la-C.), ii. 206, 270.
  Alexandria, i. 401.
  Ancyra, 359.
  Antioch, 358.
  Arausio, 432.
  Ariminium, 359.
  Arles, 432.
  Bari, ii. 205, 207.
  Basel, 314, 356, 357.
  Bézier, 173.
  Carthage, i. 284, 421, 425, ii. 11.
  Chalcedon, i. 393.
  Chiersey, ii. 293, 297.
  Constance, 356, 357.
  Constantinople—
    Second General,
    Of 381, i. 357.
    Of 540, i. 405.
    Of 680, 401.
    Later, ii. 233.
    Of 754, ii. 364.
  Cressy, 293, 297.
  Diospolis, i. 421, ii. 104.
  Ephesus, i. 392, 421.
  Florence, ii. 205, 209, 320, 328, 336, 363, 366, 372, 391.
  Frankfurt, 270.
  Hippo, 11.
  Iconium, i. 282.
  Jerusalem, 421.
  Langres, ii. 294.
  Laodicea, 11.
  Lateran, i. 401.
  Fourth Lateran, ii. 220, 233, 323, 348, 367.
  London, 361.
  Lydda, i. 421.
  Lyons, ii. 205, 209.
  Mainz, 293.
  Meaux, 335.
  Milan, i. 364.
  Nicæa, 355.
  Second of Nicæa, ii. 318, 364.
  Orange, i. 432.
  Oxford, ii. 173.
  Paris, 342, 350.
  Petrikow, iii. 20.
  Philippopolis, i. 358.
  Robber Synod, 394.
  Rome, ii. 342.
  Sardica, i. 358.
  Savonières, ii. 298.
  Seleucia, i. 359.
  Sens, ii. 212.
  Sirmium, i. 359, 364.
  Soissons, ii. 212.

Councils—
Synnada, i. 282.
Tarragona, ii. 173.
Thorn, ii. 439, 444.
Toledo, i. 374.
Toulouse, ii. 173, 323.
Tours, 270, 342.
Trent, iii. 1.
Trullan, i. 401.
Valence, i. 432, ii. 294, 298.
Vercelli, 340, 342.
Vienne, 331, 346.
Worcester, 370.
Councils, Acts of, i. 29.
Inspired by Holy Ghost, ii. 9, 21.
Courayer, iii. 133.
Cousin, iii. 284.
On Abélard, ii. 124.
Covenants, Theology of, ii. 450, 451.
Cramer on fallen angels, ii. 238.
On fall of man, 247.
On Durandus, 360.
Cranmer, ii. 458.
Bible, 458.
Catechism, 458.
Cranz, iii. 254.
Created light, ii. 233.
Creatianism, i. 211, 404, ii. 239, iii. 88. *See* Anthropology.
Creation, i. 183, ii. 34, 226, iii. 188, 332.
Prima (Immediata), iii. 190.
Secunda (Mediata), 190.
Of man, i. 211.
And Trinity, i. 185, ii. 36.
Object of, 37.
Credere Christo, Deum, Deo, in Deum, ii. 308.
Creeds—
Athanasian, i. 357, 381.
Constantinopolitan, 358.
Eusebian (four), 358.
Sirmian, 359.
Nicene, 356.
Protestant view of, iii. 68. *See* Apostles, etc.
Crell, J., iii. 19.
Crell, N., ii. 419.
Crell, S., iii. 19.
Cressy. *See* Councils.
Crethi, iii. 195.
Creuzer, iii. 266.
Crisp, ii. 458.
Criticism, Age of, iii. 230.
Biblical. *See* Biblical.
Cross, Sign of, i. 252.
As a symbol, 257.
Crusades, ii. 379.
Crusius, C. A., iii. 250.
On prophecy, 320.
Crypto-Calvinists, ii. 419, iii. 169.
Crypto-Lutherans, iii. 169.
Cudworth, ii. 454, 465, iii. 182.
Cujus regio illius religio, iii. 137.
Culture, Ancient, i. 58.
Cultus. *See* Worship.
Culverwell, ii. 465.
Cup withheld, ii. 355, iii. 149, 168. *See* Lord's Supper.
Curcellæus, iii. 24.
On atonement, 217.
Curialists, iii. 374.
Curio, iii. 20.
Cyprian, i. 91.
Works, 91.
On tradition, 130.
Unity of God, 140.
Attributes of God, 150.
Evil, 192.
Devil, 201, 203.
The fall, 232, 235.
Incarnation, 238.
Redemption, 266.
Penitence, 266.
Grace, 269.
The church, 271, 272, 274.
Ministry, 276.
Baptism, 235, 283, 284, 285.
Infant baptism, 283.
Lord's Supper, 288, 291, 292, 296.
Sacraments, 298.
Millennium, 305.
Resurrection, 310.
Heaven and hell, 315, 319.
Cyran, Abbot of St., iii. 9.
Cyril of Alexandria, i. 331.
On Holy Spirit, 373.
Nestorius, 392.
Christ's body, 399.
Julian, ii. 4.
Miracles, 7.
Lord's Supper, 77.
Cyril of Jerusalem, i. 330.
On Arian controversy, 361.
Holy Spirit, 368.
Sin, 415.
Attributes of God, ii. 32.
Angels, 47.
Devil's Conversion, 51.
Redemption, 58, 61.
Baptism, 71.
Lord's Supper, 80.
Chiliasm, 88.
Second advent, 95.

Cyril Lucar. *See* Lucaris.
Cyrus of Alexandria, i. 400.
Czengerina Confessio. *See* Confession, Hungarian.
Czerski, iii. 303.

D

Daillé. *See* Dallæus.
D'Ailly, ii. 265.
D'Alembert, iii. 238.
Dallæus (Daillé), ii. 456, iii. 109.
Damascene. *See* John Damasc.
Damiani, Peter, ii. 317.
Damianites, i. 380.
Damianus, i. 380.
Damm, C. T., iii. 239.
Dances of death, ii. 381.
Daniel—
On Tatian, i. 220.
On tradition, iii. 314.
Dannhauer, ii. 424.
Danov, iii. 248.
Dante, ii. 381, 405.
Darbyites, iii. 285, 374. *See* Plymouth Brethren.
Daub, iii. 276.
On Trinity, 331.
Devil, 334.
Atonement, 360.
D'Aubigné, iii. 284.
Davenant, Bp., ii. 457, iii. 117, 364.
David of Dinanto, ii. 137.
On Revelation, 164.
Pantheism, 190.
Death, i. 231.
Consequence of sin, 423, 425.
Death of Christ. *See* Redemption.
דִּבֶּר יְהוָה, i. 156.
Declaratio Thorunensis, ii. 439, 444.
Decrees. *See* Predestination.
Decrees of Synods. *See* Councils and Synods.
Decretals, Works on, i. 30.
Decretum Gratiani, ii. 345.
Defence of Christianity. *See* Apologetics.
Degrees of Happiness, i. 316. *See* Eschatology, Heaven.
Deified flesh of Christ, iii. 197.
Deism, iii. 29, 30, 237, 322.
English, 31, 32, 237.
French, 237.
Delbrück, iii. 313.
Delft, Synod, ii. 454.
Delft—
Preachers of, iii. 104.
Delictum, i. 414.
Delitzsch, F.—
On Trinity, iii. 331.
Demiurge, i. 138, 225.
Demon of Socrates, i. 200, 201.
Demons and Demonology, i. 192, 198, 202, ii. 47, iii. 193. *See* Devil.
Denck, iii. 19.
Denison case, iii. 381.
Denmark, iii. 281.
Dereser, iii. 301.
Derham, iii. 325.
Descartes, ii. 453.
On Being of God, iii. 183.
Occasionalism, 193.
Descensus ad inferos, iii. 207, 362. *See* Hades.
Design of Creation. *See* Creation, Providence.
Des Marets. *See* Maresius.
Deus ex Machina, i. 239.
Deutsche Theologie, ii. 139.
On the creature, 230.
On the fall, 255.
Child of Adam, 260.
Atonement, ii. 289.
Christology of, 273.
Love of God, 204.
Salvation, 305.
Devil, i. 198, ii. 47, 236, iii. 193.
Fall of, ii. 48.
Power limited, 48.
And atonement, 53.
Conversion of, 50.
Cause of sin, iii. 90.
Personal, 334. *See* Demons.
De Wette, iii. 247, 267, 283.
On revelation, 54, 311.
Tauler, ii. 138.
Ruysbroek, 139.
Deutsche Theologie, 140.
Thomas à Kempis, 140.
Interpretation, 316.
Old Testament, 321.
Christology, 330, 349.
Sin, 342.
Atonement, 358.
Freedom, 366.
Dewey, O., iii. 297.
διάβολος, i. 198. *See* Devil.
Diaconi, ii. 373.
Dialectic scholasticism. *See* Scholasticism.
διαθήκη (καινή), i. 111.
Dichotomy, i. 208, 387, 409, ii. 239.

Dick, Jno., iii. 318.
Diderot, iii. 238.
Didymus, ii. 30.
  Conversion of the devil, 50.
  Extent of atonement, 61.
  Remission of punishment, 103.
Dies iræ, ii. 381.
Dietrich, iii. 242.
διμοιρῖται, i. 389.
Dinanto. *See* David.
Dinter, iii. 263.
Diodorus of Tarsus, i. 390.
  On being of God, ii. 24.
  On remission of punishment, 104.
Diognetus, Epistle to, i. 86.
  On redemption, 256.
Dionysius the Areopagite, i. 85.
Dionysius of Alexandria, i. 325, 347, ii. 87.
Dionysius of Rome, i. 347.
Dioscurus, i. 393.
Diospolis. *See* Councils.
Dippel, iii. 239, 355.
Dipping of bread, ii. 356.
Disciplina Arcani, i. 78.
Discipline, Protestant, iii. 134.
Disputations. *See* Baden, Bern, Zürich.
διυλιζόμενοι, i. 279.
Divina Commedia, ii. 381.
Divorce, iii. 173.
Docetism, i. 66, 71, 243, 383.
Doctor Angelicus (Aquinas).
  Irrefragibilis (Alexander of Hales).
  Mellifluus (Bernard).
  Profundus (Bradwardine).
  Resolutissimus (Durandus).
  Seraphicus (Bonaventura).
  Singularis (Occam).
  Sublimis (Tauler).
  Subtilis (Scotus).
  Universalis (Alanus).
Doctrinal Theology, i. 44.
Doctrines, History of—
  Defined, i. 1.
  Catholic and Protestant views, 4.
  Relation to other branches of theology, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10, 13.
  Importance of, 17.
  Mode of treatment, 18.
  Division into periods, 22.
  Sources, 27.
  Works upon, 37.
  Connection with history of church and world, ii. 147.
Döderlein, iii. 245, 248.
Dodwell H., iii. 36.
Dodwell on immortality, iii. 227.
Dogma, i. 1.
δόγμα, i. 4.
Dominicans, ii. 261, 264, 275.
Donatists, i. 324, ii. 63, iii. 124.
Donne, J., ii. 461.
Donum Superadditum, i. 410, ii. 245, 247, iii. 71.
Dorner on Philo, i. 157.
Dorner—
  On Tertullian, i. 167.
  Origen, 171.
  Second advent, 301.
  Chiliasm, 305.
  Nicene Creed, 356.
  Apollinaris, 387.
  Nestorius, 393.
  Monothelites, 403.
  John Damascene, ii. 107.
  Adoptianism, 269.
  Nihilianism, 271.
  Soteriology, 291.
  Incarnation, 291.
  Schwenkfeld, iii. 202.
  Servetus, 203.
  Luther's Christology, 205.
  Schleiermacher, 350.
Dort (Synod)—
  Decrees, ii. 439, 444.
  On authority of Scripture, iii. 70.
  Original righteousness, 74.
  Original sin, 82.
  Supralapsarianism, 104.
  Particular redemption, 106.
Dos and beatitudo, ii. 399.
Dositheus, i. 65.
Dotes beatitudinis, ii. 396, 399.
Douay (Univ. of), iii. 65.
δουλεία, ii. 319.
Dove of Noah, i. 280.
δόξαι, i. 2.
Doxologies, i. 240.
Dresden Consensus, ii. 419.
Drobisch, iii. 277.
Dualism, i. 198, ii. 30.
Du Bose, iii. 109.
Duchoborzi, iii. 305.
Du Hamel. *See* Hamel.
Dulia, ii. 319.
Dulm, iii. 280.
δύναμις ὑψίστου, i. 172.
Duns Scotus. *See* Scotus.
Duothelites, i. 402.
Durandus, Abbot, ii. 347.
Durandus of St. Pourçain, ii. 132.
  On knowing God, 185.
  Adoptianism, 270.

Durandus of Pourçain—
Faith, ii. 310.
Transubstantiation, 360.
Matrimony, 374.
Dury (Duræus), iii. 28.
Dusanus. *See* Musculus.
δυσσεβῆ, ii. 11.

E

Eadie, iii. 298.
Eadmer, ii. 207.
Eastern Church from 4th to 6th century, i. 339. *See* Greek Church.
Ebed Jesu, ii. 113.
Eberhard, iii. 242, 385.
Ebionite and Ebionitism, i. 12, 66, 68, 69, 242, 279, 297, 302, iii. 198, 344.
Ebrard, ii. 409, 448, iii. 368.
On Zwingli, 156.
Religion, 308.
Means of grace, 377.
Ecclesia. *See* Church, i. 272.
Militans, triumphans, iii. 124.
Visibilis, invisibilis, ii. 65.
Ecclesiastical power, iii. 123. *See* Church.
Ecclesiola in Ecclesia, 371.
Eck, ii. 417, iii. 4.
Eckart, Master, ii. 137.
Pantheistic, 190, 308.
On Trinity, 220.
Grace, 308.
Hell, 403.
Eckermann, iii. 249.
Economy of redemption. *See* Redemption.
Edelmann, iii. 239.
Edict of religion, iii. 250.
Education, Theories of, iii. 339.
Edward vi., ii. 442.
Edwards, John, iii. 22.
Edwards, Jonathan, iii. 283, 295.
Edwards, Jonathan, jun., 296.
Efficacy of Scripture, i. 115.
Of Sacrament, ii. 155. *See* Sacrament and Lord's Supper.
Egilo, Abbot, ii. 339.
Ehrenfeuchter, iii. 274.
Eichhorn, iii. 246.
εἶδος, i. 380.
Eighteenth Century, Religion in, iii. 287.
εἱμαρμένη, i. 190, 218, 220.
Einsieldeln, Reform in, ii. 431.
ἔκδοσις, ii. 107.
ἔκθεσις, i. 401, ii. 107.
ἐκκλησία, i. 272, 276.
ἐκ. καθολική, 273.
ἔκπεμψις, i. 375.
ἐκπόρευσις, i. 375.
Elberfeld, iii. 299.
Eleatic School, i. 145.
Electi, Manichæan, ii. 63.
Election. *See* Predestination.
Elements, Visible, in the Sacraments, ii. 374.
Eleonora von Merlau, iii. 228.
ἔλενσις, i. 301.
Elevation of host, ii. 352, iii. 169.
Elipandus of Toledo, ii. 269.
Elizabeth, St., ii. 170.
Elizabeth of England, ii. 442.
Elkesaites, i. 69.
Elliott, iii. 390.
Elster, iii. 239.
Elucidarium on Eschatology, ii. 386, 387, 389, 393, 398, 401, 403.
Emanation, i. 159.
Emmerich, iii. 284.
Emmons, iii. 296.
Encyclopedia, Theological, iii. 274.
Encyclopedists, iii. 238.
End of creation. *See* Creation, Providence.
End of world. *See* Eschatology, etc.
Endemann, iii. 237.
ἐνέργεια, i. 400, iii. 221.
Energies in Christ, i. 400.
Engel, J. J., iii. 388.
Engelhardt on mysticism, ii. 136.
On Ruysbroek, 139.
England, Bishop, iii. 304.
England, Church of—
On the church, iii. 131.
Episcopate, 132.
Foreign orders, 132.
Against Rome, 133.
Baptism, 225.
England, Theology in, ii. 456.
English Church Union, iii. 290.
English Deism, iii. 31.
Enlightenment, Period of. *See* Rationalism.
Enoch, Book of, i. 305.
ἐνοίκησις, i. 390.
ἕνωσις φυσική, i. 390.
Enthusiasts, ii. 426, iii. 144.
Ephesus. *See* Councils.
Robber Synod. *See* Councils.
Ephraem Syrus, i. 331, 399.
On sin, 415.

Epicureans, i. 145.
Epiphanes, i. 72.
Epiphanius, i. 330.
Lord's Supper, 288.
Procession of the Spirit, 373.
Inspiration, ii. 17.
Resurrection, 91.
Episcopacy in England, iii. 124, 132. *See* England.
Episcopius, iii. 23.
On Scripture, 60.
Supralapsarianism, iii. 104.
Trinity, 181.
Epistles, Catholic, ii. 12.
Erasmus, ii. 143, iii. 5.
Erastianism, iii. 134.
Erastus, Liebler, iii. 134.
Erdmann, iii. 277.
Erigena, ii. 114, 116, 118, 119.
His rationalism, 118, 153, 162.
On Scripture, 161.
Tradition, 162.
Interpretation, 171.
Knowing God, 184.
Pantheism, 189, 226.
Trinity, 211.
Creation, 226.
Anthropology, 240.
Mosaic narrative, 247.
Sin, 253.
Sin (sex), 260.
Ideal Christ, 272.
Predestination, 296.
Lord's Supper, 340.
Resurrection, 382.
Future state, 397.
Pains of hell, 403.
Restitution of all things, 404.
Ermangardus, ii. 230.
Ernesti, i. 37, ii. 417, iii. 246, 356, 362, 378.
Erzberger, iii. 170.
Eschatology, i. 300, ii. 87, 94, 378 ff., iii. 226, 382, and art. ii. 381.
Revision of, iii. 389.
Eschenmayer, iii. 266, 277.
Ess. *See* Van Ess.
Essays and Reviews, iii. 285.
Essentia, i. 374.
Eternal generation, i. 354, iii. 185.
Eternal life. *See* Heaven, etc.
Eternal punishment, i. 320, ii. 103, 404, iii. 228. *See* Eschatology, Hell, etc.
Eternity of God, i. 133 ff.
Eternity of matter, i. 185.
Etherius, ii. 270.
Ethics, Christian, iii. 271.
Separated from theology, i. 131.
Ethnicism, i. 66.
εὐαγγέλιον, i. 112.
εὐαγγελιστής, i. 112.
Eucharist, i. 288. *See* Lord's Supper.
Eucharistic controversy, ii. 358.
Eucharistic sacrifice, i. 295, 296, ii. 86, 352.
Eudoxius, i. 385.
Eugenius III., ii. 209, 213.
Eugenius IV., ii. 327, 366, 372.
On godfathers, ii. 335.
εὐλογία, i. 288.
Eulogius of Cæsarea, i. 421.
Eunomians, i. 385.
Baptism of, ii. 76.
Eunomius, i. 362, 385, 407, ii. 27.
Eusebian confessions, i. 358.
Eusebians, i. 358. *See* Arians.
Eusebius of Cæsarea, i. 326.
On Artemon, i. 77.
Beryllus, 77.
Chiliasm, 303.
His confession, 335.
On the Son, 362.
On Holy Spirit, 367.
Defence of Christianity, ii. 4, 5.
Canon, 11.
Inspiration, 15.
Worship of angels, 44.
Devil, 48, 51.
Redemption, 60.
Lord's Supper, 82.
Future state, 99.
Eusebius Bruno, ii. 347.
Eusebius of Dorylæum, i. 394.
Eusebius of Emisa, i. 327.
Eusebius of Nicomedia, i. 327.
Eustathius of Sebaste, i. 367.
Euthymius Zigabenus, ii. 112, 364.
On inspiration, 167.
Eutychianism, i. 324, 393, iii. 197.
Eutychius, Eustathius. *See* Bonaventura.
Eutychius on resurrection, ii. 93.
Evangelical Alliance, iii. 282.
Evangelical movement in England, iii. 286 ff.
Evangelische Kirchenzeitung, iii. 361.
Evangelium æternum, ii. 164, 378.
Eve, her part in the fall, ii. 252. *See* Anthropology, Innocence, Fall, Sin.
Everlasting punishment. *See* Eternal punishment.
Evidences. *See* Apologetics.

Evil—
Nature, i. 225, ii. 40.
Origin, i. 191, 225. *See* Sin, Theodicy, Providence.
Ewald, iii. 321.
Exaltation, State of, iii. 206.
Excommunication. *See* Discipline.
Exegesis, ii. 446.
Exegesis perspicua, ii. 419.
ἐξήνεγκε, iii. 153.
Existence. *See* Being.
"Ex omnibus," Bull, iii. 9.
"Ex opere operantis," etc., ii. 325.
Exorcism, ii. 68.
Exorcistæ, ii. 373.
Expiation. *See* Redemption.
"Extra ecclesiam nulla salus," iii. 127.
Extreme Unction. *See* Unction.
Ezra, i. 111.

F

Faber, ii. 417, iii. 4.
Faber, F. W., iii. 290.
Faber, G. S., iii. 368.
Fabri, iii. 332.
Fabricius, iii. 377.
Facundus, i. 39, ii. 21.
Fairbairn, iii. 293.
Faith, i. 267.
And baptism, ii. 3, iii. 221.
Knowledge, ii. 153.
Philosophy, 308.
And works, iii. 111, 362.
Fall of angels, i. 202, ii. 46. *See* Angels.
Fall of man, i. 223, ii. 245, 251, iii. 77.
Man before, iii. 71.
Narrative of, i. 226. *See* Anthropology, Sin, etc.
Family sins, ii. 258.
Farel, iii. 162.
Farrar, Dr., iii. 385.
Fasting, iii. 172. *See* Ascetics.
Fathers, Collection of, i. 33.
Platonism of, 61.
Theology of, 78.
Study of, in England, iii. 289.
Faucheur, Le, iii. 109.
Faustus, i. 410, 435.
Feast of all Souls, ii. 390.
Febronianism, iii. 374.
Febronius, iii. 300.
Feder, iii. 209.
Federal Method, ii. 450.
Feet, Washing of. *See* Washing.
Felgenhauer, iii. 228.
Felix of Urgella, ii. 269.
"Felix Culpa," ii. 292.
Fénélon, iii. 13.
Fermentarii, ii. 363.
Ferrier, J. F., iii. 291.
Festival of immaculate conception, ii. 264. *See* Mary.
Feuerbach, iii. 280.
On religion, 280, 308.
Atheistic, 324.
Incarnation, 343.
Feuerborn, iii. 121.
Fichte, J. C., iii. 264.
Fichte, J. H., iii. 277, 347, 359, 388.
Ficinus. *See* Marsilius.
Fides. *See* Faith.
Qua, Quæ, ii. 309.
Justificans, ii. 309.
Formata, ii. 309.
Informis, ii. 309.
Sola justificat, iii. 112.
Fidus, Bishop, i. 278.
Field, R., ii. 461.
Figken, iii. 27.
Filioque, ii. 205.
Filius Adoptivus, ii. 70. *See* Adoptianism.
Final Method, ii. 424.
Fines for Punishment, ii. 367.
Fire. *See* Purgatory and Purifying.
Fischer, K., iii. 277.
Fish, a symbol, ii. 280.
Fisher. *See* Piscator.
Fistulæ Eucharisticæ, ii. 356.
Flaccus Albinus. *See* Alcuin.
Flacius, iii. 86.
On sin, ii. 419, iii. 86.
Flagellantes, ii. 289, 380.
Flamingians, iii. 17.
Flathe, ii. 110.
Flatt, iii. 261.
Flavel, ii. 458.
Flavian, i. 394.
Flaviana, Epistola, i. 394.
Fleas, when created, iii. 190.
Flesh, Resurrection of, i. 307.
Flesh of Christ deified, iii. 197.
Florence. *See* Councils.
Florus, Magister, ii. 297.
Fock on Socinianism, iii. 60, 190, 204.
Folioth. *See* Robert of Melun.
Folmar, ii. 270.
Foot-washing, iii. 376.
Forbes, Bishop W., iii. 117.
Foreknowledge, i. 269, ii. 34. *See* Predestination.

Forer, iii. 201.
Forerunners of Reformation, ii. 313, 317.
Form of Eucharist, iii. 170.
Formal principle of Protestantism, ii. 408, iii. 39.
Formicus Maternus, J., ii. 4.
Formula Consensus, ii. 437, 444.
On inspiration, iii. 61.
Authority of confessions, 70.
Original sin, 82.
Extent of redemption, 106.
Obedience of Christ, 213.
Formula Concordiæ, ii. 420.
On Scripture, iii. 43.
De tertio usu legis, iii. 67.
Symbols, 70.
Original sin, 81.
Flacianism, 87.
Predestination, 101.
Universality of grace, 104.
Irresistible grace, 106.
Justification, 113.
The Mass, 150.
Lord's Supper, 162, 165.
Unio personalis, 201.
Against Æpinus, 207.
Descensus ad inferos, 209.
Active and passive obedience, 212.
Formula μακρόστιχος, i. 358, 364.
Formula Philippopolitana. *See* Sirmian Formula.
Foscarari, Bishop Egidius, iii. 3.
Fox, Geo., iii. 26.
France, iii. 282, 299.
Franciscans, ii. 261, 275.
Francke, ii. 431, iii. 234.
François de Sales. *See* Sales.
Frank, Sebastian, ii. 427.
On Scripture, iii. 50, 63.
Sin, 87.
Freedom, 99.
Creation, 191.
Christology, 202.
Redemption, 213.
Frankfurt. *See* Councils.
Fraser, A. C., iii. 293.
Fratricelli, ii. 110, 324.
Fredegis of Tours—
On inspiration, ii. 166.
Creation, 227.
Pre-existence, 241.
Frederick I., ii. 313.
Frederick III., Elector Palatine, ii. 419.
Frederick II., the Great, iii. 234, 237, 300.
Frederick William II., iii. 250.
Free Church, Scotch, iii. 293.
Freedom, i. 217, 426, ii. 34, iii. 94, 362. See Anthropology.
Freedom and Grace, iii. 941.
Free-thinkers, iii. 29.
Freidank, ii. 313.
French Deists, iii. 31, 237.
Materialists, 31.
Philosophy of, 285.
French Revolution, iii. 374.
Fresenius, iii. 256.
Frey, iii. 310.
Freylinghausen, iii. 236.
Friedlieb, ii. 423.
Friends of light, iii. 241, 280.
Friends, Society of, iii. 16, 25 ff.
Fries, iii. 277.
Fritzsche on Calvin, ii. 435.
Froude, R. H., iii. 290.
Fulgentius Ferrandus, i. 397.
Fulgentius of Ruspe, i. 337.
On sin, 436.
Creation, ii. 37.
Angels, 43.
Fuller, T., ii. 461.
On Jewel, ii. 459.
Fullo. *See* Peter.
Fureiro, iii. 3.

G

Gabler, iii. 277.
Gabriel Biel. *See* Biel.
Gale, Theoph., ii. 464.
Gallen, Monks of St., 165.
Gallic Confession on Purgatory, iii. 44.
Gallitzin, iii. 304.
Gansfort. *See* Wesel.
Gasparin, De, iii. 317.
Gass, iii. 270.
On Protestant Scholasticism, ii. 425.
Calixt, 430.
Calvin, ii. 440, iii. 178.
Arminianism, 25.
Gassen, Conv. in, iii. 20.
Gassner, iii. 336.
Gaunilo, ii. 178.
Gaup, iii. 274.
Gaussen, iii. 284, 317.
Gelasius I., i. 437, ii. 85.
Gellert, C. F., iii. 241.
Gemistius Pletho, ii. 144.
General Councils—
Nicæa,
Constantinople,

General Councils—
Ephesus, .
Chalcedon,
Constantinople. *See* Councils.
General judgment. *See* Judgment.
Generation, Eternal, i. 354.
Genetic method of Oetinger, iii. 251.
Geneva Catechism, ii. 439.
Consensus. *See* Consensus G.
Church in, iii. 282, 299.
Genevensis Consensus, ii. 439.
Genii, i. 193.
Gennadius, i. 247, 337, 406, 410, 436, ii. 50.
γέννησις, i. 375.
Gentilis, J. V., iii. 20.
Genus idiomaticum, apotelesmaticum, auchematicum (in Person of Christ), iii. 207.
Geoffrey of Vendome on Extreme Unction, ii. 369.
Georgii on Justin, i. 174.
Georgius of Laodicea, i. 361.
Gerardi, iii. 17.
Gerbert, Sylvester II., ii. 117.
On Lord's Supper, 337, 341.
Gerhard, Jno., ii. 423.
Anthropology, 89.
On the fall, iii. 90, 91.
Traducianism, 89, 91.
Creation, 193.
Christology, 207.
Offices of Christ, 208.
Obedience of Christ, 212.
Baptism, 223.
Gerhard Groot, ii. 147.
Gerhard Zerbolt, ii. 174.
German Catholicism, iii. 299.
German reformed theology, ii. 451.
German school of painting, ii. 149.
Germanic nations, ii. 113.
Germanus, ii. 103.
Germar, iii. 316.
Gernler, ii. 444.
Geroch, ii. 272.
Gersen, Abbot, ii. 140.
Gerson, ii. 141.
On inspiration, 169.
Knowing God, 186.
Theistic, 191.
Psychology, 241.
Image of God, 249.
Immaculate conception, 265.
Lord's Supper, 354.
Indulgences, 365, 368.
Purgatorial fire, 389.
Gess, Christology, iii. 352.
Gibbon on Petavius, iii. 6.
Gichtel, iii. 137.
Gieseler, iii. 273.
Gieseler—
On millenarianism, i. 303.
Athanasian Creed, 382.
Julianists, 398.
Apocrypha, ii. 12.
Redemption, 56.
Lord's Supper, 78.
Aquinas, 129.
Durandus, 132.
M. Ficinus, 244.
Seven sacraments, 324.
Giessen divines, iii. 206.
Gilbert of Poitiers, ii. 124.
On Trinity, 213.
Gillespie, J., iii. 133.
Gislebert on the Jews, ii. 108.
Glarus, Reform in, ii. 431.
Glorified flesh of Christ, iii. 197.
γνῶσις, i. 57, 63, 71, 131, 267.
Gnosis, Gnostics, Gnosticism, i. 66, 70, 312.
And Old Testament, 99, 152.
Classified, i. 70, 72.
On penalty, 152.
On Logos, 161.
On fate, 220.
Sin, 225.
Fall, 228.
Baptism, 285.
Future state, 315.
Gobarus, S., i. 39.
Goch, John, ii. 147.
God—
Being, i. 133, ii. 22, 174, iii. 183, 324.
Nature, i. 144, ii. 26.
Unity, i. 138, ii. 30, 196.
Trinity, iii. 176 ff.
Attributes, i. 144, 149, ii. 31, 192, 197, 203, iii. 184.
Creator, ii. 227.
God-man, i. 239, 243.
God-parents, ii. 331, 333, 336.
Goethe, iii. 266, 376.
Gomarists, iii. 104.
Gomarus, iii. 23.
Good works. *See* Works
Goodwin, T., iii. 134.
Gorham case, iii. 381.
Görres, iii. 301.
Göschel, iii. 277.
Gospels, i. 52.
Gospels, Spurious, i. 113.
Gossner, iii. 301.

Gottfried of Vendôme, Sacramenta, ii. 321.
Gottschalk, ii. 294.
Götze, iii. 240, 313.
Government of world, i. 189, ii. 37, 226, iii. 188.
Grace, ii. 302 ff., iii. 95.
Applied, ii. 302 ff.
Irresistible, iii. 106.
Want of, i. 271, ii. 62, iii. 140.
And freedom, i. 426, iii. 362.
Means of, i. 271. *See* Church and Sacraments.
γραφή, γραφαί, ii. 14.
Gratia gratis dans, gratis data, gratum faciens, ii. 303.
Gratian, ii. 8.
Gratiosa inhabitatio, iii. 207.
Grebel, iii. 17.
Greek Church, ii. 110, 173, iii. 15.
In Middle Ages, ii. 110, 173, 239.
In Reformation Era, iii. 14.
In Russia, 305.
On transubstantiation, ii. 362.
On marriage, 376.
Purgatory, 391.
Scripture, iii. 45.
Church authority and councils, 46.
Sacraments, 141.
Mass, 151.
Cup, 169.
Intermediate state, 174.
Gregg, iii. 318.
Gregory the Great, i. 388.
On Agnoëtism, 399.
Traducianism, 408.
Anthropology, 409, 410.
Image of God, 410.
Sin, 412, 413.
The fall, 437.
Sin and grace, 437.
Augustinianism, 433, 437.
Canon, ii. 13.
Inspiration, 16.
Councils, 9, 21.
Knowledge of God, 29.
Angels, 43, 46.
Devil, 48, 50, 51.
Death of Christ, 59, 61.
Extent of atonement, 61.
The church, 66.
Heretics, 66.
Sacraments, 69.
Eucharist, 86.
Resurrection, 92.
Purgatory, 97, 388.
Future state, 99.
Gregory VII., ii. 148.
On Berengarius, 342.
Gregory XIII., iii. 110.
Gregory XV. on immaculate conception, iii. 87.
Gregory of Nazianzus, i. 329.
On Holy Spirit, 367, 370.
Trinity, 375, 376.
Apollinaris, 388.
Sin, 415, 420.
Councils, ii. 21.
Being of God, 23.
Nature of God, 29.
Attributes, 31.
Trinity in creation, 37.
Angels, 43, 44, 45, 47.
Devil, 48, 50.
Redemption and the devil, 51, 55.
Atonement, 58.
Baptism, 50, 60, 70, 72.
Baptism of blood, 72.
Baptism of heretics, 75.
Lord's Supper, 83, 85, 86.
Resurrection, 90.
Judgment, 94.
Purifying sin, 96.
Future state, 98, 99.
Heaven, 100, 102.
Hell, 101.
Remission of punishment, 103.
Gregory of Nyssa, i. 32Q.
On dogma, 3.
On Holy Spirit, 369.
Procession of Holy Spirit, i. 372.
Trinity, i. 374.
Apollinaris, 387.
Traducianism, 407.
Image of God, 409.
Sin, 412, 416.
Conversion of devil, ii. 48.
Redemption from devil, 53.
Extent of atonement, 59, 61.
Baptism, 70.
Eucharist, 79.
Resurrection, 90.
Purgatory, 96.
Heaven, 100.
Future punishment, 102.
Remission of punishment, 103.
Gregory XVI., Pope, iii. 302.
Gregory Thaumaturgus, i. 325.
Gregory of Valentia, iii. 201.
Gribaldi, iii. 20.
Griesbach, iii. 250.
Grimm on hell, ii. 394.
Grindal, ii. 457.
Groningen School, iii. 285.

Groot, Gerh., ii. 147.
Grosmann, C., ii. 438.
Grotius, Van Groot, iii. 24.
On atonement, 215.
Grundtvig, iii. 282.
Gruner, J. F., iii. 248.
Grynæus, S., ii. 438.
Guardian angels, i. 50.
Gubernatio generalis et specialis, ii. 37.
Güder, iii. 385.
Guibert of Nogent, ii. 403.
Guido de Brès, ii. 443.
Guitmundus, ii. 347.
Guizot, iii. 282.
Günther, iii. 302.
Guntrad, ii. 339.
Gürtler, ii. 451.
Guyon, Mme., iii. 13.

H

HADES, i. 263, 312, ii. 61. *See* Intermediate State.
Hadrian, Pope, ii. 319.
Häfeli, iii. 282.
Haffenreffer, ii. 425, iii. 57, 190.
Hafner, iii. 284.
Hague School of Theology, iii. 285.
Hahn, A., iii. 262.
Hahn, J. M., 384.
Hales. *See* Alexander.
Hall, Bishop J., ii. 461.
Hall, R., on Edwards, iii. 295.
Haller, B., ii. 432, iii. 245.
Halyburton, iii. 36.
Hamann, i. 19.
Hamel, Du, iii. 14, 110.
Hamerken. *See* Kempis.
Hamilton, Sir W., iii. 292.
Hammond, H., iii. 133.
Hampden, R. D., iii. 290.
Hands, Laying on of. *See* Confirmation.
Hardenberg, Alb., ii. 419.
Harms, Cl., iii. 271.
Harmsen. *See* Arminius.
Hartenstein, iii. 277.
Hase, iii. 278.
On Gregory of Nyssa, i. 329.
Jerome, 333.
Erigena, ii. 117.
Scholasticism, 117.
Peter Lombard, 125.
Eckart, 137.
Hus, 315.
Being of God, iii. 184.
Hase—
Nicolai, iii. 241.
Religion, 307.
Trinity, 331.
Christology, 351.
Hasenkamp, iii. 354, 361.
Hasse on scholasticism, ii. 114.
On Anselm, 122.
Hävernick, iii. 321.
Heathen, Virtues of, iii. 78, 107.
Heathenism, History of, i. 12.
Forms of, 66.
Miracles of, 106.
Heaven, i. 316, ii. 98, 393. *See* Eschatology.
Hebraists, iii. 62.
Hebrew vowel points, iii. 62.
Hebrews, Ep. to, i. 57, ii. 12, 13.
Heerbrand, ii. 423.
Hegel and Hegelians, iii. 274.
On scholasticism, ii. 142.
Anselm, 179.
Religion, iii. 274, 308.
Theology, 317.
Being of God, 327.
Trinity, 330.
Sin, 342.
Christology, 349.
Atonement, 359.
Freedom, 366.
Church, 372.
Sacraments, 380.
Hegel of Gera on creation, iii. 190.
Hegesippus, i. 65.
Hegner, iii. 346.
Heidanus, ii. 450.
Heidegger, ii. 444, 449.
On the fall, iii. 90, 91.
Creation, 190.
Angels, 194.
Heidelberg Catechism, ii. 440.
Original sin, iii. 82.
Extent of atonement, 105.
Faith, 115.
Sacraments, 144.
Mass, 152.
Lord's Supper, 164.
Trinity, 178.
Ubiquity of Christ, 200.
Atonement, 212.
Obedience, 212.
Heilmann, iii. 247.
Heinrich—
On Chemnitz, ii. 422.
Zachariä, iii. 247.
Döderlein, 248.
Mursinna, iii. 249.

Hell, i. 316, ii. 98, 393. *See* Eschatology.
Hellenizing, i. 66.
Helmstädt divines, iii. 118.
Helvetic confessions, ii. 437, 438, 441.
On Scripture, iii. 43.
Interpretation, 47, 48.
Creed of Damasus, 69.
Original righteousness, 74.
Original sin, 84.
Freedom, 100.
Predestination, 105.
Faith, 115.
Church, 126.
Priesthood and ministry, 130.
Magistracy, 134.
Invocation of saints, 138.
Image-worship, 139.
Sacraments, 142.
Opus operatum, 144.
Mass, 152.
Cup, 153.
Purgatory, 174.
Trinity, 178.
Communicatio idiomatum, 200.
Minister of baptism, 226.
Departed spirits, 228.
Helvetius, iii. 238.
Hemmert, Van, iii. 315.
Henderson, A., ii. 457.
Hengstenberg, iii. 273, 389.
Henhöfer, iii. 301.
Henich, ii. 424.
Henke, iii. 247, 249, 310, 323, 339, 363, 379, 384.
Henning, N., ii. 423.
Henoticon of Zeno, i. 396.
Henriciani, ii. 110.
Henry of Lausanne, ii. 110.
Henry VIII., iii. 41.
Henry, M., ii. 465.
Henry of Gent, ii. 185.
Heppe on Haffenreffer, ii. 423.
Cocceius, 450.
Germ. ref. theology, 451.
Melanchthon, iii. 58.
Heraclius, i. 400.
Herbart, iii. 277.
Herbert of Cherbury, iii. 31, 34.
Herder, iii. 267, 268.
On religion, 306.
Revelation, 311, 313, 316.
Old Testament, 321.
Spinoza, 323.
History of creation, 332.
Man, 339, 340.
Life of Christ, 345.
Herder—
Work of Christ, iii. 356.
Predestination, 367.
Heresiarch, i. 65.
Heresies, i. 63, 340.
History of, 10.
Ancient, 341.
Mediæval, ii. 109, 378.
Heresy and civil power, iii. 134.
Heretic, Catholic and, i. 78.
Heretics, Christian, ii. 66.
Heretics, Baptism of, i. 283, 284.
Heringa, iii. 283.
Hermann. *See* Arminius.
Hermas, Pastor of, i. 81.
On creation, 184.
On angels, 196.
Demons, 201.
Devil, 204.
Hades, 264.
Penitence, 265, 267.
Predestination, 269.
Water, 279.
Chiliasm, 303.
Hermeneutics, iii. 46, 47. *See* Bible.
Hermes, Geo., iii. 301.
Hermes of Halle, iii. 251.
Hermogenes, i. 186.
Heros of Arles, i. 421.
Herrnhut, iii. 253.
Herzog on Lutheranism and Calvinism, ii. 409.
Hess, iii. 282.
Hessen, ii. 420.
Hesshus, Tilemann, ii. 419.
Hesychasts, ii. 233.
Hetzer, iii. 19.
Heumans, iii. 377.
Hexaëmeron, i. 184.
Heylin, ii. 462.
Heyn, iii. 386.
Hickes, G., ii. 462, iii. 287.
Hierarchia cœlestis, ii. 235.
Hierarchy, ii. 312.
Hierarchy of angels, ii. 42.
Hilary of Arles, i. 382.
Hilary of Poitiers, i. 333.
On Holy Spirit, 367.
Trinity, 376.
Docetism, 384.
Creatianism, 405.
Soul, 406, 409.
Sin, 417.
Canon, ii. 13.
Devil, 50.
Adoptianism, 269.
Redemption, 57.

Hilary of Poitiers—
Lord's Supper, ii. 82.
Hildebert a Lavardino, ii. 124.
Hildebert of Mans, ii. 172.
Hildebert of Tours—
Transubstantiation, ii. 345, 346.
Penance, 366.
Hildebrand. *See* Gregory VII.
Hildebrand, Joachim, ii. 424.
Hildesheim chalice, ii. 351.
Hilgenfeld, iii. 277.
Hillmer, iii. 251.
Hincmar, Archbishop, ii. 293.
Hippo. *See* Councils.
Hippolytus, i. 94.
Philosophoumena, 94.
On Trinity, 183.
Antichrist, 306.
Underworld, 314.
Intermediate state, 314.
Hirscher, iii. 302.
Historical proof for existence of God, ii. 176.
Historical School, iii. 277.
Hitzig, iii. 321.
Hoadley, iii. 379.
Hobbes, iii. 31, 34, 37.
Hoburg, iii. 64.
Hoch. *See* Æpinus.
Hochhuth, iii. 51.
Hochrütener, iii. 17.
Höfling, iii. 381.
Hofmann, J. C. K., iii. 278, 320, 361.
Hofmann, Melchior, iii. 20.
On the Incarnation, 203.
Hofstede de Groot, iii. 285.
Hogel, iii. 190.
Hohenheim, Von. *See* Paracelsus.
Holder, W., ii. 350.
Holiness of God. *See* Attributes.
Holland, iii. 22.
Hollaz—
On Inspiration, iii. 62.
Anthropology, 88.
Traducianism, 89.
Attributes, 184.
Creation, 190.
Demons, 194.
Holy Ghost, i. 171, 366.
Procession of, 371, ii. 204. *See* Trinity.
Holzfuss, iii. 27.
Homilies, English, ii. 458.
Hommius, ii. 443.
Homoiousios, i. 360, 363.
Homoousia, i. 355. *See* ὁμοούσιος, etc.
Homuncionitæ, i. 365.
Hondt, De. *See* Canisius.
Honorius, Pope, i. 401.
Honorius, Emperor, i. 421.
Honover, i. 155.
Hontheim, iii. 300.
Hook on the Succession, iii. 373.
Hooker, R., ii. 460.
Eccles. polity, iii. 131.
Ordination, 132.
Hooper, Bishop, ii. 459.
Hopkins, S., iii. 295.
Hopkinsianism, iii. 296.
Hormisdas, i. 397.
Hornbeck, ii. 449.
Hornejus, iii. 93.
Horsley, iii. 288.
Hosius, i. 355.
Hospinian, ii. 422.
Hossbach on Dannhauer, ii. 424.
Host, The—
Elevation of, ii. 352, iii. 169.
Worship of. *See* Lord's Supper, etc.
Howe, J., ii. 464, iii. 283.
Huber, S., iii. 109.
Hubmeier, iii. 17.
Hufnagel, iii. 247.
Hug, iii. 301.
Hughes, J., iii. 304.
Hugo of St. Caro, ii. 165.
Hugo Lingonensis, ii. 341.
Hugo of St. Victor, ii. 125.
On reason, 159.
Canon, 165.
Inspiration, 168.
Interpretation, 171, 172.
Being of God, 179.
Attributes, 194.
Omnipresence, 194.
Unity of God, 197.
Omnipotence, 200.
Abélard, 203.
Trinity, 222, 225.
Creation, 227, 228, 229.
Theodicy, 232.
Angels, 234, 236, 237.
Soul and body, 240.
Creatianism, 240.
Psychology, 241.
Image of God, 247, 248.
Liberty, 249.
Sin, 254.
Atonement, 284.
Faith, 309.
Universal priesthood, 314.
Vicar of Peter, 314.
Sacraments, 320, 321.
Design of sacraments, 326.

Hugo of St. Victor—
Transubstantiation (Transitio), ii. 346, 347.
Extreme unction, 369.
Resurrection, 383.
Purgatory, 389.
Hülsemann, ii. 424.
Hulsius, ii. 451.
Humanitarianism, iii. 180.
Humanity of Christ, i. 244. *See* Christology.
Humbert, Cardinal, ii. 342, 363.
Capernaitic, 338, 344.
Hume, D., iii. 238, 291, 318.
Humiliation, State of, iii. 206.
Hundeshagen on Gerson, ii. 141.
Hungarian Confession. *See* Confession.
Hunnius, iii. 110.
Hurd, R., iii. 245.
Hus, J., ii. 145.
On Scripture, 164.
Indulgences, 311.
Universal priesthood, 314.
Church, 314.
Sacraments, 324.
Confirmation, 336.
Cup in Supper, 356.
Transubstantiation, 361.
Husites, ii. 146, 391.
Husite war, ii. 356.
Hutter, Leonh., ii. 422, iii. 193.
Hydroparastates, i. 288.
Hymenæus, i. 307.
Hymnology, i. 27, 31.
Hyperdulia, ii. 261, 262, 319.
Hyperius, ii. 447, iii. 185.
On allegorizing, iii. 66.
Hypostasis of Son, i. 179, 344, 355, 374, 380.
Hypostaticus, Character, iii. 185.
Hypothetical universalism, ii. 455, iii. 107.

I

Ἰχθυς, i. 280.
Iconium. *See* Councils.
Iconoclasts. *See* Images.
Ideal and historical Christ, ii. 268, iii. 346, 348.
Idealism, i. 144, iii. 264, 265.
ἰδιοποίησις, iii. 207.
ἰδιότης, i. 374.
Ignatius and his Epistles, i. 82.
On Logos, 162.
Trinity, 177.
Angels, 196.
Ignatius—
Christology, i. 243.
Redemption, 256.
Hades, 264.
Church, 273, 275.
Lord's Supper, 289, 295.
Ignis Purgatorius. *See* Fire and Purgatory.
ἱλασμός, iii. 359.
Ildefons of Toledo, i. 115.
Illuminati, iii. 241.
Illuminatio, iii. 120.
Image-worship, i. 324, ii. 318, 364, iii. 137.
Image of God, i. 214, 409, ii. 245, 248.
Imitation of Christ. *See* Kempis.
Immaculate conception. *See* Mary.
Immanence, Theory of, iii. 323.
Immersion. *See* Baptism.
Immolatio in Lord's Supper, ii. 352.
Immortality, i. 217, 221, 410, ii. 242, iii. 227, 326, 388.
Impanation, ii. 358, 360.
Imputation of sin, i. 117, 233.
Of Christ's obedience. *See* Justification.
Incarnation. *See* Christology.
Without the fall, ii. 291.
Indefectible grace, iii. 106.
Indelible character of sacraments, ii. 325.
Independency, Works on, iii. 134.
Indulgences, ii. 308, 311, 365, 367, 388, 407, iii. 172.
In eminenti, Bull, iii. 9, 110.
Infallibility, ii. 312.
Infant baptism, i. 277, 281, 282, ii. 330, iii. 16.
In extremis, 226.
Infants dying not baptized, ii. 74.
Inferos, Descensus ad. *See* Hades.
Infralapsarianism, iii. 95, 103.
Infusio gratiæ, ii. 302.
Innocence, State of, i. 229, 404, ii. 245, iii. 71.
Innocent I., i. 421, ii. 13, 369.
Innocent III.—
On Bible-reading, ii. 173.
Angels, 233.
Sacraments, 323.
Indelible character, 328.
Transubstantiation, 350.
Confession, 367.
Extreme unction, 369.
Mahomet, 380.
Innocent X., iii. 111.
Innocent XI., iii. 14.

Inquisition, ii. 148.
Insinuatio, ii. 369.
Inspiration, i. 115, ii. 14, 166, iii. 55, 314.
  Continuance of, ii. 20.
  And Revelation, i. 75, iii. 62.
Institutio, ii. 369.
Intention in sacraments, ii. 325.
Intercession, i. 267.
Interim, ii. 418.
Intermediate state, i. 312, ii. 393, iii. 173, 386. *See* Hades, Eschatology.
Internal world, iii. 49.
Interpretation of Bible, i. 123, ii. 14, iii. 56.
  Patristic, i. 125, ii. 18.
  Mediæval, ii. 170.
  Free, iii. 47.
  Swedenborg on, 321.
Invisible Church. *See* Church.
Invocatio. *See* Worship.
Irenæus, i. 88.
  Works, 88.
  O. T. types, 102.
  On Gospels, 112.
  Inspiration, 118, 119.
  Interpretation, 126.
  Tradition, 128, 129.
  Name of God, 142.
  Anthropomorphism, 148.
  Penalty, 152.
  Logos, 167.
  Holy Spirit, 173.
  Trinity, 173.
  Subordination, 179.
  Creation, 185, 188.
  Providence, 190, 191.
  Angels, 194.
  Devil, 199, 202, 203.
  Demons, 199.
  Anthropology, 209, 211.
  Image of God, 214, 216.
  Freedom, 220.
  Immortality, 222.
  Fall, 227, 232, 234.
  Christology, 237, 245.
  Sinlessness of Christ, 250.
  Redemption, 254, 258, 260.
  Hades, 264.
  Justification, 268.
  Predestination, 269.
  Church, 273, 275.
  Baptism, 280.
  Infant baptism, 282.
  Lord's Supper, 288, 290, 295.
  Second advent, 301.
Irenæus—
  First resurrection, i. 302.
  Chiliasm, 303, 304.
  Resurrection, 309.
  Last judgment, 314.
  Intermediate state, 314.
  Heaven and hell, 317.
Irosius, ii. 5.
Irresistible grace, iii. 106.
Irving, Edward, iii. 284, 289, 352.
Irvingites, iii. 285, 373.
Isenbiehl, iii. 301.
Isidore of Pelusiun, i. 432.
Isidore of Seville, i. 338.
  Sentences, ii. 112.
  Canon, 164.
Italian Philosophy, iii. 29.
Ivo of Chartres on extreme unction, ii. 369.

J

Jackson, T., ii. 461.
Jacob of Tagritum, ii. 113.
Jacob de Theramo, ii. 290.
Jacobellus of Misa, ii. 145, 356.
Jacobi, iii. 266, 267, 314.
  Christology, 349.
Jacobi, F., iii. 268.
Jacobites, i. 342, 400, ii. 111.
Jahn, iii. 301.
Jahrbücher f. deutsche Theol., iii. 279.
Jahrbücher f. wissenschaftl. Kritik, iii. 276.
Jaldabaoth, i. 138, 200, 229.
James, Ap., i. 55.
Janow, ii. 381.
Jansen, iii. 9.
Jansenists and Jansenism, iii. 8, 94, 108, 302, 374.
  On inspiration, 65.
  Sin, 94.
  Predestination, 110.
  Lord's Supper, 171.
Jehoshaphat, Valley of, ii. 385.
Jena, University of, ii. 418.
Jeremiah, Epistle of, ii. 12.
Jeremias II., Patriarch, iii. 15.
Jerome, i. 333.
  On Ebionites, 302.
  Trinity, 375.
  Christ's body, 399.
  Creatianism, 406, 408.
  Pelagius, 421.
  Canon, ii. 13.
  Inspiration, 15, 16, 17.
  Providence, 39.

Jerome—
Devil, i. 50.
Church, 66.
Heretics, 67, 104.
Eucharist, 86.
Eschatology, 88.
Resurrection, 91.
State of lost, 102, 104.
Jerome of Prague, ii. 145.
Charged with tetratheism, 212.
On transubstantiation, 361.
Jerusalem, Destruction of, ii. 6.
Jerusalem, the philosopher, iii. 245.
Jesuits, iii. 4, 5, 11.
Theology of, 4, 9.
On inspiration, 65.
Pelagians, 88, 94.
Jesus. *See* Christ.
Jetzer, ii. 265.
Jewel, ii. 459.
Jews, i. 66, ii. 108, 151.
Joachim of Floris, ii. 169, 220.
On millenarianism, 378.
Works, 379.
Joannes Monachus, ii. 211.
Johannes a Cruce, iii. 12.
John, Apostle, i. 55.
John Baptist, ii. 262.
John II., Pope, i. 397.
John IV., i. 401.
John XXII., ii. 137.
As Antichrist, ii. 380.
On sleep of soul, ii. 392.
John of Antioch, i. 392.
John Ascusnages, i. 379.
John Cornubiensis, ii. 271.
John Damascene, ii. 106.
On Bible, 161.
Tradition, 162.
Canon, 165.
Inspiration, 166.
Bible-reading, 174.
Cosmological argument, 176.
Knowing God, 184.
Attributes of God, 193.
Procession of Holy Ghost, 206.
Trinity, 211.
Creation, 229, 231.
Angelology, 234.
Anthropology, 240.
Immortality, 242.
State of innocence, 246.
Image of God, 247.
Fall, 253.
Original sin, 256.
Christology, 268, 272.
Redemption, 275.
John Damascene—
Predestination, ii. 294.
Faith, 309.
Worship of Virgin, 317.
Images, 318, 319.
Sacraments, 324.
Transubstantiation, 363.
End of world, 380.
Resurrection, 385.
John Duns Scotus. *See* Scotus.
John of Fidanza. *See* Bonaventura.
John of Jerusalem, i. 421, ii. 91.
John de Montesono, ii. 265.
John of Paris on transubstantiation, ii. 359.
John Philoponus. *See* Philoponus.
John Picus. *See* Mirandola.
John of Salisbury, ii. 128.
On reason and Scripture, 160.
Tradition, 162.
Canon, 165.
Two swords, 313.
Freedom of church, 314.
John Scotus Erigena. *See* Erigena.
John Sigismund, ii. 444.
John of Trani, ii. 363.
Johnson, John, ii. 463, iii. 287.
Jonas, ii. 416.
Joris, iii. 20, 115.
Joseph, St., ii. 265.
Joseph II., Emperor, iii. 300.
Joseph II., Patriarch, iii. 15.
Josephus on inspiration, i. 115.
On the fall, iii. 90.
Jovinian, ii. 65, 102.
Jowett, B., iii. 291.
Judaism. *See* Jews.
Judaizing tendency, i. 68.
Jude, Ap., i. 55.
Judgment, Last, i. 312, ii. 94, 385.
Jukes, A., iii. 385.
Julian the Apostate, ii. 4.
Julian of Eclanum, i. 421, 423, 425, 427, ii. 18.
Juliana of Liège, ii. 352.
Julianists, i. 398.
Julius Africanus, i. 203.
Jung Stilling. *See* Stilling.
Junilius, ii. 40.
Junkheim, iii. 365.
Jurien, iii. 109.
Justice of God, i. 152. *See* Attributes.
Justification, i. 265, 267, iii. 111, 362.
Controversy on, ii. 419.
Justin Martyr, i. 85.
On O. T. types, 101.

Justin Martyr—
Inspiration, i. 117.
Unity of God, 138.
Names of God, 141.
Attributes, 149.
Omniscience, 151.
Logos, 163, 173, 174.
Holy Spirit, 173, 174, 175.
Subordination, 179.
Creation, 184, 185, 186.
Providence, 189.
Incarnation, 163.
Angels, 194, 195, 196, 197.
Demons, 199, 200, 201.
Anthropology, 209.
Image of God, 215.
Freedom, 218.
Immortality, 222.
Sin, 226.
Fall, 230, 233.
Christology, 240, 241, 242, 244.
Sinlessness of Christ, 250.
Redemption, 254, 256, 259, 265.
Hades, 264.
Repentance, 266.
Grace, 269.
Predestination, 269.
Baptism, 279.
Infant baptism, 281.
Lord's Supper, 288, 290, 295.
Second advent, 301.
First resurrection, 302.
Chiliasm, 303.
Resurrection, 308.
Last judgment, 313.
Intermediate state, 313.
Annihilation of world, 316.
Heaven and hell, 317, 320, 321.
Justinian, i. 397.
Justitia originalis, i. 229, ii. 245, 256.

K

Kahnis—
On Justin Martyr, i. 174.
On Luther, iii. 157.
Lord's Supper, 380.
καινὴ διαθήκη, i. 111.
Kaiser, iii. 376.
Kala, i. 155.
καλεῖν, i. 273.
κανονιζόμενα, ii. 12.
κανών, i. 109.
Kant, i. 27, iii. 258.
On Trias, 264.
Religion, 307.
Old Testament, 315.
Kant—
Miracles, iii. 318.
Being of God, 325.
Evil, 338.
Christology, 344, 346.
Atonement, 357.
Freedom, 364.
Faith, 365.
Church, 371.
Immortality, 387.
Kant's philosophy, iii. 258 ff.
Karg, Geo., iii. 213, 218.
Karrer, iii. 376.
Karsten, iii. 323.
καταλλαγή, iii. 359.
Kautz, iii. 20.
Keble, iii. 284, 314, 373.
Keckerman, ii. 448.
Keller, iii. 301.
Kempis, T. à, ii. 140.
Imitation of Christ, 140.
On justification, 310.
Lord's Supper, 354.
Ken, iii. 287.
κένωσις, iii. 206.
Kenrick, F. P., iii. 304.
Kerner, iii. 336.
κήρυγμα ἀποστολ., i. 62.
Kettlewell, ii. 457.
Ketzeralmanach on Danov, iii. 248.
Kienlen, iii. 284.
Kieser, iii. 341.
King, Archbishop, ii. 462.
Kingdom of Christ, ii. 37. *See* Church.
Kingsley, iii. 289.
Kirchenblatt, iii. 283
Kirchner, T., ii. 413.
Klaiber, iii. 361.
Klausen on Ernesti, iii. 246.
Klebitz, W., ii. 419.
Klee—
On Rupert of Deutz, ii. 359.
On ordination, 371.
On spiritual knights, 335.
κλῆσις, κλητοί, i. 273.
Kliefoth, i. 24.
Klopstock, iii. 241.
Knapp, iii. 262, 378.
Knighthood, Spiritual, ii. 335.
Knipperdölling, iii. 17.
Knobel, iii. 321.
Knowing God, ii. 26 ff. *See* God.
Knowledge, Sources of religious, i 108, ii. 8, 161, iii. 39.
Knox, John, ii. 460.
Knutsen, iii. 31.

Koch. *See* Cocceius.
Kohlbrügge, iii. 368.
κοινωνία τῶν θείων, iii. 207.
König, J. F., ii. 425.
Koppen, iii. 277.
Körner, Christoph, ii. 420.
Köthen conference, iii. 280.
κράμα, i. 288.
Krause, iii. 281.
Krautwald, ii. 427, iii. 166.
Krug, iii. 277, 306, 357.
Krummacher, iii. 368.
κρίψις, iii. 206.
Ktistolatri, i. 398.
Kuhlmann, Quirinus, ii. 429, iii. 137.
Kuhn, iii. 301.
Kurtz, iii. 321.

L

LABADIE, ii. 452, iii. 137.
On Scripture, iii. 53.
Baptism, 225.
Labadists, iii. 225.
La Combe, iii. 13.
Lactantius, i. 333.
On unity of God, 140.
Christology, 345.
Holy Spirit, 366.
Traducianism, 405.
Immortality, 410.
Sin, 411.
Religion, ii. 2.
Prophecy, 8.
Scripture, 14.
De ira Dei, 33.
Existence of evil, 40.
Angels, 42, 47.
Devil, 49.
Church, 66.
Chiliasm, 88.
Resurrection, 90.
End of world, 94.
Future punishment, 101.
Lactis et mellis degustatio, iii. 220.
Lady-day, ii. 261.
Lagus, ii. 440.
Laity and clergy, ii. 371. *See* Clergy.
Lakermann on sin, iii. 93.
Lambeth articles, ii. 459.
La Mennais, iii. 303.
La Mettrie. *See* Mettrie.
Landerer on Anselm, ii. 157.
Lanfranc, ii. 121.
Works, 341.
On Lord's Supper, 341.
Lange, Joachim, iii. 229, 234, 367.
Lange, J. P., i. 20, iii. 278.
On religion, 308.
Christology, 351.
Church, 372.
Eschatology, 390.
Lange, K. R., iii. 378.
Langres. *See* Councils.
Laodicea. *See* Councils.
Lapsi, i. 284.
Lardner, iii. 244.
Lasco, iii. 165.
Last judgment. *See* Judgment.
Last things. *See* Eschatology.
Lateran. *See* Councils.
Latimer, ii. 458.
Latin Church. *See* Western Church.
Latin language, ii. 148.
Latitudinarians of England, ii. 453, 465, 466, iii. 289.
λατρεία, ii. 319.
λατρεία ἀναίμακτος, ii. 79.
Latrocinium Ephesinum. *See* Councils, Robber Synod.
Laud, Archbishop, ii. 461.
Laukhard, iii. 239.
Laurentius Valla, ii. 143.
Lavater, iii. 257, 282, 298, 318.
Law, W., iii. 36, 287.
Lay baptism, iii. 226.
Lay confession, iii. 367.
Laying on of hands. *See* Confirmation.
Lazarus of Aix, i. 421.
Leade, Jane, ii. 453.
Le Blanc, ii. 451.
Lechler on Wolf's philosophy, iii. 235.
Lectores, ii. 373.
Lee, W., iii. 318.
Leibnitz, iii. 28, 30.
On union, 28.
Theodicy, 188, 192, 193.
Leibnitzo-Wolfian system, iii. 234.
Leighton, Archbishop, ii. 463.
Leipzig colloquium, ii. 445.
Leipzig disputation, iii. 99, 273.
Leipzig divines, iii. 121.
Leland, J., iii. 36.
Lempus on transubstantiation, ii. 341.
Leo Allatius, ii. 391.
Leo of Acrida, ii. 363.
Leo Judæ, ii. 438.
On the sacraments, 146.
Leo the Great, i. 337.
On Trinity, 378.
On Eutychianism, 394.

Leo the Great—
Christ's body, i. 399.
Councils, ii. 21.
Extent of atonement, 61.
Intermediate state, 61.
Church, 66.
Sacramentum, 68.
Baptism, 72.
Leo III., ii. 205.
Leo IX., ii. 342, 363.
Leo X., ii. 242.
Leonistæ. *See* Cathari.
Leporius, i. 391, 399.
Leslie, C., ii. 463, iii. 36, 245.
Less, G., iii. 245, 250.
Less, L., iii. 110.
Lessing, iii. 238, 240.
On perfectibility of Christianity, 310.
Tradition, 312.
Trinity, 330.
Eschatology, 385.
Lewis the Bavarian, ii. 380.
Lex Fomitis, ii. 331, iii. 221.
Leydecker, ii. 451, iii. 109.
Leyden, Univ. of, ii. 454.
School of, iii. 285.
Liber concordiæ, ii. 420.
Liberty. *See* Freedom.
Liberty and grace, i. 246. *See* Grace.
Libri ecclesiastici, i. 110, ii. 11.
Lichtfreunde, iii. 280.
Liebler. *See* Erastus.
Liebner, iii. 278.
On Hugo of St. Victor, ii. 171, 179.
On sacraments, ii. 322, 326.
Christology, iii. 351, 352.
Light, created or uncreated, ii. 233.
Lignon, Peter du, ii. 452.
Lilienthal, iii. 245.
Limborch, iii. 24.
On Scripture, 59.
State of innocence, 75.
Grace, 98.
Faith, 116.
Lord's Supper, 167.
Trinity, 182.
Atonement, 217.
Limbus infantum, patrum, ii. 393, 394.
Lindner, ii. 65.
Lingard, iii. 304.
Liturgies, i. 31.
Mozarabic, ii. 269.
Loci theologici, ii. 421, 423.
Locke, iii. 30, 33.
Löffler, iii. 356.
λογοπάτωρ, i. 364.
λόγος, i. 156, 344, ii. 211.
Logos, doctrine of, i. 153, 237, iii. 179.
In Philo, i. 157, 159.
In St. John, 158.
To the time of Origen, 160.
In Origen, 168.
λόγος ἄσαρκος, iii. 206.
ἐνδιάθετος and προφορικός, i. 157, 350, iii. 179.
σπερματικός, i. 103, 134, 156, 173, 264, 364.
Lokwitz (Loquis), ii. 146.
Lollards, ii. 145.
Lombard. *See* Peter.
London synod, ii. 442.
Longinus, S., ii. 318.
Lope de Vega, iii. 12.
Lord's Supper, i. 286, ii. 77, 337, iii. 148, 375.
Sacrifice in, i. 295.
Consubstantiation, ii. 78.
Transubstantiation, 78, iii. 148 ff.
Spiritual participation, 161.
Different theories of, ii. 79.
Symbolical, metabolical, ii. 78, iii. 154.
Cup in, ii. 355, iii. 168.
Bread used, ii. 362.
Matter, form, and object, iii. 170.
Efficacy, 155.
Elevation of Host, iii. 169. *See* Eucharistic Sacrifice, Mass, Transubstantiation, etc.
Lord's Supper, Greek Church on, ii. 362.
Löscher, iii. 109, 235.
Lothair, ii. 209.
Lots, casting of, iii. 376.
Loudun synod, ii. 455.
λουτρόν, i. 278.
Louvain University, iii. 65
Controversies, 107.
Love feasts, iii. 376.
Love of God, i. 149.
Loyola, iii. 5.
Lucaris, Cyril, iii. 14.
Lucian, ii. 5.
Lucidus, i. 433.
Lucifer, ii. 237.
Lücke, i. 61, 170, iii. 273.
On Augustine, ii. 9.
On millenarianism, ii. 379.
Lullus, Raimundus, ii. 131.
On Trinity, ii. 224.

Luther—
Uncertainty of grace, ii. 304.
Theses, 407, 412, 413, iii. 41.
As a reformer, ii. 408, 411.
His experience, 408.
And Melanchthon, 411.
Life and works, 412.
Bible translation, 414.
Articles of Schmalkalden, 415, 417.
On scholastics, 120.
On mystics, 138, 139, 140.
Tauler, 138.
Catechisms, 418.
On Scripture, iii. 40, 51.
Interpretation, 47.
On Deutsche theologie, 140.
Inspiration, 56, 63.
Epistle of James, 57, 65.
Ceremonies, 68.
On his own authority, 70.
Original righteousness. 72.
Fall and original sin, 78.
Traducianism, 89.
Bondage of will, 99.
Justification . and indulgences, 40.
Good works, 113.
The church, 125.
Priesthood, 128.
On heresy, 135.
Images, 140.
Number of sacraments, 141.
Transubstantiation, 150.
On Henry VIII., 150.
The Mass, 151.
Lord's Supper, 157.
Confession, 172.
Trinity, 177.
Being of God, 184.
Attributes, 185.
Creation, 188.
Angels, 194.
Devils, 194.
Incarnation, 198.
Allœosis, 199.
Ubiquity, 159.
Christology, 198, 204.
Atonement, 211.
Baptism, 221.
Infant baptism, 224.
Lutheranism, ii. 408.
Controversies, 418.
Systematic theology, 7, 421.
Decrees, iii. 95.
Church, 128.
Reformed, ii. 428.
Lutheranism and Calvinism, ii. 408, 418 ff.
Attempts at union, iii. 27, 36.
Decrees, 95.
Faith, 115.
Economy of salvation, 120.
Worship, 123.
Ordination, 128.
Lord's Supper, 149.
Christology, 197, 207.
Christ's humiliation, 206.
Atonement, 218.
Baptism, 221.
Lutheran mysticism, ii. 426.
Lutheran symbolical books, ii. 415.
Lütkemann, ii. 429.
λύτρον, i. 252.
Lutz, iii. 320.
Lyons, Canons of, ii. 261.
Lyons. *See* Councils.
Lyser, iii. 110

M

Maccovius, ii. 448.
Macedonians, i. 324, 366, 371.
Macedonius, i. 370.
Mackintosh on Edwards, iii. 295.
Magdeburg controversy, iii. 347.
Magee, Archbishop, iii. 288.
Magister sententiarum. *See* Peter Lombard.
Magistracy, iii. 134.
Magnetism, iii. 334.
Magus, Simon, i. 65.
Mahomet (Mahometanism), ii. 109, 152.
Mahomet as Antichrist, ii. 380.
Maimbourg, iii. 7.
Maimonides, Moses, ii. 168.
Maistre, Joseph de, iii. 303.
Major, George, ii. 418.
On justification, iii. 118.
Majorinus, ii. 64.
Majus, Heinrich, ii. 413.
Makowsky. *See* Maccovius.
μακρόστιχος Formula, i. 358, 364.
מַלְאַךְ יְהוָה, i. 156.
Malakaus, iii. 305.
Malan, iii. 285.
Malchion, i. 351.
Maldonatus, iii. 6.
Malebranche, iii. 30, 193.
Mallet on the devil, iii. 337.
Man before the fall. *See* Fall.
Mandeville, iii. 35.

Manichæism, i. 342, ii. 11, 14, 30, 36, 40, 63, 110.
Manning, iii. 290, 304.
Mansel, Dean H. L., iii. 289, 290, 311.
Μαντική, i. 115, ii. 17.
Manuel, ii. 265.
Manutius, Paul, iii. 3.
Manz, iii. 17.
Marathonius of Nicomedia, i. 371.
Marbach of Strassburg, iii. 101, 170.
Marburg colloquy, iii. 158, 159.
Marcellus of Ancyra, i. 363.
On the Holy Spirit, 373.
On eschatology, ii. 89.
Marcion, i. 72, 112, 243.
Marcionites, i. 285.
Maresius, ii. 449.
Marheinecke, i. 274, iii. 276.
On Montanus, i. 75.
On baptism.
On Trinity, iii. 331.
Atonement, 360.
Justification, 364.
Marino, Archbishop Leon, iii. 3.
Mariolatry. *See* Mary, Saints.
Marius Mercator, i. 419.
Maronites, i. 402, iii. 305.
Marriage. *See* Matrimony.
Of angels, i. 203.
Of priests, ii. 374.
Marsh, Bishop H., iii. 246.
Marsilius Ficinus, ii. 144, 244.
Martensen, iii. 278.
On the devil, 337.
On Christology, 352.
Sacraments, 377.
Martin I., i. 401.
Martini, Rud., iii. 20.
Martyr, P., ii. 446.
Creatianism, iii. 90.
In England, ii. 460.
Martyrs, i. 253, 278.
Marun, Abbot, i. 402.
Mary, The Virgin—
θεοτόκος, i. 391.
Mother of God, 391.
Immaculate conception, ii. 260, iii. 343.
Partus Virgineus, i. 391, ii. 274.
Worship of, ii. 262, 317.
Relation to atonement, 280.
Intercessor, 317.
Psalter of, 317.
Mass, iii. 128, 151.
Sacrifice of, ii. 346, 352, iii. 148, 151.
Masses: for dead, ii. 97, iii. 151, 173.
Private, 151.
Massilienses, i. 432.
Master of Sentences. *See* Peter Lombard.
Materialism, iii. 31.
Matrimony as a sacrament, ii. 68, 69, 322, 374, iii. 141, 172, 173.
Matter (*see* ὕλη), i. 72, 185.
Matter of Eucharist, iii. 169.
Matthias of Janow, ii. 314.
Maurice, F. D., iii. 289, 362, 385.
Maurus. *See* Rabanus.
Maximus, i. 401.
Means of Grace, i. 271. *See* Church and Grace.
Meaux. *See* Councils.
Mediæval art, ii. 381.
Mediate imputation, ii. 455.
Megetius, ii. 269.
Meier on Arius, i. 354.
On Hilary, 368.
Homoousia, 370.
Tritheism, 380.
Gerson, ii. 141.
Wessel, 146.
Meier, Sebastian, ii. 432.
Melanchthon, ii. 411, 414.
Works, 414.
Confessions of Faith, 415.
Controversies, 414, 418.
And Greek Church, iii. 15.
On the three creeds, 69.
Inspiration, 58.
Original sin, 78.
Freedom, 100.
Sacrament, 141.
Number of sacraments, 141.
Trinity, 177.
Being of God, 184.
Creation, 189.
Preservation, 192.
Angels, 194.
Atonement, 211.
Melchiades, ii. 69.
Meletius, i. 3.
Melito of Sardis on corporeity of God, i. 147.
Melun. *See* Robert.
Melville, Andrew, ii. 460.
Memnon, i. 393.
Memra, i. 158.
Menander, i. 65.
Mendel. *See* Neander.
Mendelssohn, iii. 325.
Menken, iii. 352.
Mennas of Constantinople, i. 325.

Menno Simonis, iii. 17.
Docetism of, 197.
Mennonites, iii. 16.
Confession of, 17.
Scripture, 49.
Sacraments, 143, 145.
Washing of feet, 143.
Lord's Supper, 167.
Creation, 190.
Baptism, 223.
Re-baptism, 225.
Mentzer, iii. 208.
Mercy of God, i. 149. *See* Attributes.
Merit, i. 265, 267, ii. 308, iii. 112.
Merits of Christ. *See* Redemption.
Meritum, ex condigno, Ex congruo, ii. 310.
Messiah, i. 160.
Mestrezat, iii. 109.
Μεταβάλλεσθαι, ii. 364.
μεταβολή, i. 290.
Metabolical view of the Supper, iii. 154.
μετάνοια, i. 265.
Μεταποιεῖσθαι, ii. 364.
Metempsychosis, iii. 386.
Methodism, iii. 257.
On grace, 366.
On predestination, 368.
Methodius of Patara, i. 346.
Methodius, i. 325, 415, ii. 35, 88, 90.
Methone. *See* Nicolas of.
Mettrie, La, iii. 238.
Meyer, iii. 384.
Michael Cerularius, ii. 363.
Michaelis, iii. 245, 246.
Middle Ages, Works on, i. 31.
Miehl, iii. 301.
Migration of souls, iii. 386.
מקרא, i 272.
Militant church. *See* Church.
Mill, iii. 243.
Millenarianism, i. 75, 300, 303, ii. 87, 379, iii. 389, 390. *See* Eschatology.
Milman, Dean, iii. 291.
Milner, John, iii. 304.
Milton, John, ii. 466.
Ministerium, iii. 130.
Minnesingers, ii. 317.
Minucius Felix, i. 87.
Works, 88.
Theology, 134.
Unity of God, 139.
Minucius Felix—
Providence, i. 190.
Demons, 200, 201.
Freedom, 218.
Christology, 240.
Knowledge, 267.
Predestination, 269.
Resurrection, 307, 310.
Eschatology, 320.
Miracle plays, ii. 290.
Miracles, i. 99, 105, ii. 5, 152, iii. 306, 314.
Mirandola, J. P., ii. 144, 161.
Mirandola, F. P., ii. 146.
Mislenta, iii. 93.
Missa, ii. 86.
Missale Romanum, iii. 3.
Missionary Societies, iii. 273.
Modalism, i. 180, 348. *See* Sabellianism.
Mogilas, P., iii. 14.
Möhler, iii. 302.
On allegorizing, i. 125.
Clement, 166.
Justin, M., 197.
Apollinaris, 388.
Anselm, ii. 179.
Justification, iii. 113.
Faith, 117.
Molanus, Abbot, iii. 28.
Moleschott, iii. 324.
Molina, iii. 9, 110.
On predestination, 110.
Molinæus. *See* Moulin.
Molinos, iii. 112.
Spiritual guide, 121.
Moma, ii. 450.
Momiers, iii. 285, 299.
Monads, iii. 192.
Monarchianism, i. 74, 160, 178.
μόναις, i. 350.
Monasticism, i. 432, ii. 147.
Moneta of Cremona—
On Immortality, ii. 244.
On purgatory, 391.
Monophysitism, i. 12, 324, 341, 393, ii. 27.
Monotheism. *See* Unity of God.
Monothelites, i. 324, 341, 400, ii. 267.
Montaigne, iii. 31.
Montanus, Montanism, i. 74, 109, 116, 272, 277, 300, 305.
Moral argument for being of God, ii. 175.
Moral interpretation, iii. 314.
Moravians, iii. 378. *See* Bohemian Brethren.

More, Hen., ii. 465.
Morell, J. D., iii. 318.
Morgan. *See* Pelagius.
Morgan, Thomas, iii. 35.
Morlin, Joachim, ii. 419, iii. 118, 219.
Mors æterna, iii. 209.
Mortal sins, ii. 252.
  Protestant view, iii. 87.
Mortality, ii. 260.
Morus, iii. 248.
Mosaic account of creation, ii. 34, 226, iii. 188, 332.
Moscorovius (Catechism), iii. 21.
Mosheim, i. 93, iii. 235, 247.
Mothe, de la. *See* Guyon, Fénélon.
Mother of God. *See* Mary.
Moulin, P. du, iii. 109.
Mozley, iii. 368.
Mülhusana Confessio, ii. 437.
Müller, G., iii. 282.
Müller, H., ii. 429.
Müller, Joh. von, on Monks of St. Gallen, ii. 165.
Müller, Jul., iii. 278.
  On Augustine, i. 412.
  Pelagius, 427.
  Augustine's view of freedom, 428.
  On sin, 343.
  Christology, 353.
  On freedom, 367.
Münscher, i. 23.
  On Tertullian, 147.
  Clement, 166.
  Marcellus, 365.
  Inspiration, ii. 20.
  Jerome, 104.
  Sacraments of O. T., 327.
  Gaunilo, 178.
  Bradwardine, 301.
Münster Anabaptists, iii. 17.
Munus propheticum,
  Sacerdotale,
  Regium, iii. 208.
Münzer, iii. 17, 115.
  On church, 131.
Mursinna, iii. 249.
Musculus, W., ii. 447.
  On baptism, iii. 221.
Müslin. *See* Musculus.
Μυστήριον, i. 298, ii. 374. (Sacramentum.)
Muth, iii. 301.
Myconius, ii. 438, 446.
  On Lord's Supper, iii. 161.
Mysticism, ii. 125, 134.
  Mediæval, 135, 149, 273, 289.
  Protestant, 426, 452.
Mysticism—
  Lutheran, ii. 426.
  Reformed, 452.
  Roman Catholic, iii. 11.
  On the internal word, 491.
  Church, 135.
  Lord's Supper, 170.
  Creation, 188.
  Trinity, 186.
  Christology of, 198.
  Redemption, ii. 289.
Mythical theory, iii. 319.
Mythology, Works on, i. 12.
Myths, iii. 319.

N

Name of Christ, Superstitious use of, ii. 48.
Natalis (Noël) Alexander, iii. 14.
Naturalism, iii. 29, 237.
Nature, Book of, ii. 163.
Nature, Philosophy of. *See* Schelling.
Nature of God, i. 144, ii. 26.
Natures in Christ, i. 324, ii. 267. *See* Christology.
Nazarenes, i. 69, 239, iii. 176, 197.
Neander—On Bardesanes, i. 190.
  Origen, 354.
  Holy Spirit, 373.
  Nestorianism, 391, 392.
  Chrysostom, 416.
  Pelagius, 421, 438, ii. 97.
  Predestinatus, i. 433.
  Gregory, 437.
  Church, ii. 9, 65.
  Augustine, i. 438, ii. 9, 68.
  Theodore, 18.
  Pelagius and Augustine on Baptism, 73, 75.
  East and West on baptism, 73.
  Eucharist, 79.
  Eusebius, 82.
  Athanasius, 83.
  Abélard, 155.
  Agobard, 167.
  Scotus on Eucharist, 340.
  Lutheranism and Zwinglianism, 409.
  Catholicism and Protestantism, iii. 37.
  Luther and Melanchthon, 141.
Neander, Michael, ii. 413.
Nelson, R., iii. 22, 287.
Nemesius, i. 331.
  On pre-existence, 404.

Nemesius—
On creation, ii, 38, 39.
Freedom of will, 415.
Neoplatonism, iii. 233.
Nepos, ii. 87.
Nestorianism, i. 12, 341, 389, ii. 267, iii. 197.
On marriage, ii. 376.
Nestorius, i. 371.
Netherlands, iii. 281, 299.
New England, Theology in, ii. 458.
New Haven Theology, iii. 294.
New Jerusalem Church, iii. 371. *See* Swedenborg.
Newman, F. W., iii. 318.
Newman, J. H., iii. 284, 290, 304, 373.
Newton, I., iii. 244.
Nicæa, Council of, i. 355.
Second Council, ii. 364.
Nicene Creed, i. 356.
Nicetas Choniates, ii. 112, 268.
On Trinity, 218.
Nicetas Pectoratus, ii. 363.
Nicholas, Michel, on the Logos, i. 158.
Nicolai, C. F., iii. 241.
Nicolai, Melchior, iii. 208.
Nicolaitans, i. 65.
Nicolas, Aug., iii. 303.
Nicolas I., ii. 205.
Nicolas Cabasilas, ii. 141.
Nicolas de Clémangis, ii. 163.
On Faith, 315.
Nicolas of Methone, ii. 112.
On the knowledge of God, 185.
Unity, 196.
Trinity, 210.
Immortality, 243.
Freedom, 257.
Christology, 268.
Redemption, 276.
Eucharist, 364.
Nicolaus of Cus, ii. 355.
Nicole, iii. 10.
On Eucharist, 171.
Nihilianism, ii. 267.
Nihilum, privativum and negativum, ii. 227.
Nilus on Lord's Supper, ii. 83.
Nitsch, G., on Scripture, iii. 62.
Nitzsch, iii. 273, 278.
On miracles, ii. 6.
On religion, iii. 307.
On atonement, 359.
νοήματα, i. 2.
Noëtus, i. 75, 160, 181, 348.
Nogent. *See* Guibert of.
Nominalism, ii. 121, 210, 213.
Nonjurors, ii. 458.
Norris, J., ii. 465, iii. 36.
North Africans, ii. 113.
Norton, A., iii. 297.
Nösselt, iii. 245.
νόθα, ii. 11.
Notiones personales (Trinity), iii. 185.
νοῦς, i. 156, 386, ii. 211, 240.
Novalis, iii. 266.
Novatian, i. 92.
Name of God, 143.
Christology, 241, 242, 243, 244.
Controversy, 272.
Novum testamentum, instrumentum, i. 111, 119.
Nye, iii. 134.

O

Oakley, F., iii. 290.
Oaths, iii. 17.
Obedientia activa, iii. 212.
Oblations, i. 295.
O'Brien, Bishop, iii. 364.
Occam, ii. 132, 149.
On the being of God, 182.
Knowledge of God, 186.
Faith, 310.
Elevation of Host, 352.
Transubstantiation, 358, 359.
Occasionalism, iii. 193.
Occhino, iii. 20.
On satisfaction, 213.
Octavius of M. Felix, i. 87.
Odo of Cambray, ii. 241.
Odo of Clugny, ii. 172.
Oecolampadius, ii. 438, 446.
On church discipline, iii. 134.
On Lord's Supper, 151, 156.
Oecumenical Councils. *See* General.
Oegger, iii. 257.
Oetinger, iii. 250, 257, 321.
On Lord's Supper, 378.
Eschatology, 384.
Offices of Christ, ii. 62, iii. 206, 208, 362.
Oil. *See* Extreme Unction.
Oischinger, iii. 302.
Olevianus, ii. 439, 441.
Old Testament (*see* Bible), i. 100.
Protestant views of, iii. 67.
Rationalist views of, 321.
Oliva, P., ii. 374.
Olshausen, iii. 316, 318.
Om, i. 155.

Omniscience, Limited, iii. 185. *See* Attributes.
ὁμοιούσιος, i. 360, 363, 381.
ὁμολογούμενα, ii. 11.
ὁμοούσιος, i. 350, 355, 356, 357, 373.
Oncken, iii. 380.
ὄνομα, i. 141.
Onomolatry, iii. 249.
Ontological argument, ii. 23, 175, iii. 325.
Oosterzee, Van, iii. 285.
Opera ad intra, ad extra, iii. 183.
Opera attributiva (Trinity), iii. 185.
Opera œconomica (Trinity), iii. 185.
Operationes Spiritus, iii. 120.
Ophites, i. 72, 230, 297.
Optatus of Mileve, ii. 64, 76.
Optimism, iii. 193.
Opus, ex opere operantis, and ex opere operato, ii. 325.
Orange. *See* Councils.
Orders, Sacrament of, ii. 68, 322, 371, iii. 141, 172. *See* Ordinations and Sacraments.
Ordination: Matter and Form—
  By heretics, ii. 371, 373.
  Age of ordained, 373.
  Seven classes, 373.
  Indelible, 371, 373.
Ordinatio Vaga, iii. 130.
Ordo Salutis, ii. 293, iii. 94.
Origen, i. 93.
  Works, 94.
  On Ebionites, 69.
  Canon, 113, ii. 12.
  Inspiration, i. 120.
  Interpretation, 125.
  Tradition, 129, 130.
  Being of God, 137, 143.
  Anthropomorphism, 146.
  Omnipresence, 150.
  Omniscience, 151.
  Justice, 153.
  Omnipotence, 160.
  Logos, 168.
  Holy Spirit, 176.
  Trinity, 182.
  Creation, 187.
  Providence, 191.
  Angels, 193, 194, 196, 197.
  Demons, 199, 200, 201, 204.
  Devil, 203.
  Restoration of Satan, 205.
  Anthropology, 210.
  Pre-existence, 211, 212.
  Image of God, 215, 216.
Origen—
  Freedom, i. 219.
  Immortality, 223.
  Sin, 225, 226.
  The fall, 227, 232, 235.
  Christology, 240, 242, 245, 247, 248, 249.
  Sinlessness of Christ, 251.
  Redemption, 255, 257, 260, 261, 262, 264.
  Hades, 264.
  Remission of sin, 266.
  Penitence, 266.
  Faith, 268.
  Predestination, 270.
  Church, 273.
  Peter, 274.
  Baptism, 281, 285.
  Infant baptism, 282.
  Lord's Supper, 294, 296.
  Millennium, 305.
  Resurrection, 310.
  Purifying fire, 315.
  Future state, 315, 318, 321, ii. 51.
Origenism, Fate of, i. 325.
Origenists, i. 325.
Origin of soul, 211. *See* Creatianism, Traducianism.
Original righteousness. *See* Fall.
Original sin, i. 298, 414, 418, 422, ii. 256, 419, iii. 77.
  Flacian controversy, ii. 419. *See* Sin.
Original sin and baptism, i. 420.
Orosius, i. 421.
Orthodox church. *See* Greek.
Orthodox pietism, iii. 250.
Orthodoxy, Ancient, i. 324.
Osiander, A., ii. 419, iii. 118, 208.
Osiander, L., ii. 420.
  Justification, iii. 117.
  Atonement, 211, 218.
  Water of baptism, 223.
Osterwald, iii. 235.
Ostiarii, ii. 373.
Ostorodt, iii. 19.
  On Scripture, iii. 54.
  Lord's Supper, 167.
  Christology, 203.
Ott, iii. 17.
Otto, Bishop of Bamberg, on number of sacraments, ii. 322.
Otto, Emperor, ii. 313.
οὐρανοί, i. 161.
οὐσία, i. 374, 379.
Overall, iii. 132.
Owen, J., ii. 464, iii. 134.

Oxford Council on Bible-reading, ii. 173.
Oxford school, iii. 289, 373.
On purgatory, 387. *See* Newman, Pusey, Keble.

P

PÆDOBAPTISM. *See* Infant Baptism.
Paine, T., iii. 245.
Pajon, ii. 456, iii. 109.
Palames, ii. 233.
Paley, iii. 245, 326.
Pallavicini, iii. 1.
Palmer, iii. 274.
Pamphilus of Cæsarea, i. 325.
Paneitas, ii. 358.
παυοπλία, ii. 109.
Pantheism, i. 181, ii. 188, 283, 308, 396, iii. 29, 188, 264, 322.
Pantheras, i. 240.
Papacy, i. 275, ii. 312, 317.
As a state, iii. 134.
Papal decretals, i. 30.
Papias, i. 84, 303.
Paracelsus, ii. 427, iii. 170.
Paraclete, i. 171.
Paradise, i. 316, ii. 396. *See* Heaven, Eschatology, etc.
παράδοσις, i. 109.
ἀποστολική, i. 62.
Paris, University of, ii. 149, 392. *See* Councils.
Parker, Archbishop, ii. 459.
Parker, Theod., iii. 285, 297, 318.
παρουσία, i. 300.
Parr on Hooker, ii. 461.
Particularism of Grace. *See* Atonement.
Partus Virgineus. *See* Mary.
Pascal, iii. 10.
Paschasius Radbertus—
Scripture, ii. 172.
Virginity of Mary, 262.
Sacraments, 321.
Lord's Supper, 328, 341.
Passaglia, iii. 343.
Passive obedience, iii. 209, 218, 354.
Pastoris, Adam Martini, iii. 180.
Paterini, ii. 110.
Patrick, St., on Purgatory, ii. 389.
Patripassians, i. 180, 352, 361. *See* Praxeas, Sabellius.
Patrology (Patristics), i. 9.
Paul, Apostle, i. 55.
Works on, i. 53.
Paul, Apostle—
On Logos, 159.
On resurrection, 306.
Paul of Constantinople, i. 401.
Paul III., ii. 417.
Paul V., iii. 110.
Paul of Samosata, i. 351.
Revived, iii. 20.
Paulicians, i. 342, ii. 110, 165, 332.
Paulinus, i. 419.
Paulus, H. E. G., iii. 262.
Paulus Orosius, i. 421.
Pearson, ii. 463.
Peccatum. *See* Sin.
Peccatum Originale, i. 298. *See* Sin and Original Sin.
Pedagogics, Modern, iii. 339.
πηγὴ θεότητος, ii. 207.
Pelagius and Pelagianism, i. 406, 416, 418, 422, 427, ii. 63, 73, 74, 96, 260, iii. 344.
Penance, first and second, i. 255, iii. 172.
As a sacrament, ii. 365, iii. 141, 145, 171, 172.
Matter and form, ii. 365, 366.
Penn, W., iii. 26.
Penny preachers, ii. 311.
Pepuzians, i. 75.
Perfectibility, iii. 309.
περιχώρησις, ii. 267, iii. 199.
Periods in history of doctrine, i. 22.
Neander and Baumgarten-Crusius on, 23.
Rosenkranz, 24.
Kliefoth, 24.
Perrone, iii. 300.
Persecution, iii. 135.
Perseverantia, iii. 120.
Persona, i. 374.
Persons. *See* Trinity.
Petavius (Pétau), iii. 6.
Peter, Apostle, i. 55.
Successors, 275.
The swords, ii. 312, 313.
Peter of Bruys, ii. 110.
On infant baptism, 331.
Peter of Callinico, i. 380.
Peter of Clugny, ii. 109, 332.
Peter Damiani, ii. 317.
On sacraments, 322.
Baptism, 334.
Peter Fullo, i. 397.
Peter Lombard, ii. 125.
On omnipotence, 195, 200.
Trinity, 216.

Peter Lombard—
Creation, ii. 229.
Angels, 216, 237.
Creatianism, 240.
State of innocence, 246.
Image of God, 247.
Original sin, 252, 259.
Sinlessness of Mary, 263.
Nihilianism, 270.
Atonement, 285.
Election, 300.
Grace, 303.
Faith, 309.
Latria, 319.
Sacraments, 320.
Seven sacraments, 322.
Sacraments in Old Testament, 326.
Grace of baptism, 331, 332.
Lord's Supper, 347, 349.
Cup in Lord's Supper, 356.
Penance, 365, 366.
Extreme unction, 369, 370.
Ordination, 372.
Matrimony, 374, 375.
Resurrection, 383.
Judgment, 387.
Purgatory, 390.
Heaven, 394, 398, 403.
Hell, 403.
Peter Martyr Vermilias. *See* Martyr.
Peter Mogilas, iii. 14.
Peter Oliva. *See* Oliva.
Peter of Poitiers, ii. 126, 128, 179.
Petersen, W., iii. 228.
Petilian, Donatist, ii. 76.
Petrobrusiani, ii. 110, 324.
Petrus Siculus, ii. 165, 173.
Peucer, Caspar, ii. 419.
Peyrère, De la, iii. 88.
Pfaff, C. M., iii. 235, 369.
Pfeffinger, ii. 419.
Φάρμακον ἀθανασίας, ii. 80.
Phenomenal method, ii. 424.
Philanthropy, iii. 338.
Philetus, i. 64.
Philip, Landgrave, iii. 28.
Philippi, F. A., iii. 278, 362.
Philippists. *See* Melanchthon.
Philippopolis. *See* Councils.
Phillpotts, Bishop, iii. 381.
Philo, i. 60.
On Interpretation, 119, 120.
Inspiration, 115.
Omnipresence, 150.
Logos, 157, 159.
Angels, 195.
Demons, 203.
Philo—
Fall, i. 227, iii. 90.
Philopatris, ii. 5.
Philoponites, ii. 93.
Philoponus, i. 380, ii. 93.
Philosophumena of Origen, i. 94.
Philosophy—
History of, i. 13.
In early Christian writers, 60.
Oriental, 153.
Scholastic, ii. 142.
Modern, iii. 29.
In Italy, 29.
In Germany, iii. 233, 263.
In Scotland, 291.
Philosophy and Theology, iii. 29, 233.
Philostorgius, ii. 27.
Philoxenus (Xenaias), i. 398.
Photinus, i. 364, iii. 176.
Φωτισμός, i. 278.
Photius, i. 111, 112, ii. 206.
Phthartolatri, i. 398.
Φθόρα, i. 398.
Physico-theological argument, ii. 22, iii. 325.
Physiology, ii. 239.
Φύσις, i. 380.
Pictet, ii. 446, 454.
Picus. *See* Mirandola.
Pierius, i. 346.
Pietists, i. 26, ii. 429, iii. 120, 192, 250, 255.
On sin, 88, 94, 342.
Repentance, 366.
Sacraments, 378.
Pighius, Von Campen, iii. 5.
Pilgrim's Progress, ii. 464.
Pilkington, ii. 457.
Piscator on active obedience, iii. 212, 218.
πίστις, i. 131.
Pistorius, Adam, iii. 20.
Pithopæus, ii. 440.
Pius II. *See* Æneas Sylvius.
Pius IV., iii. 3.
Pius V. on Bajus, iii. 9, 110.
Pius IX., iii. 302.
Placæus, De la Place, ii. 454, 455.
On sin, iii. 87.
Planck, iii. 247.
Plato on Logos, i. 156.
Platon, Archbishop, iii. 305.
Platonism, i. 386, ii. 118, 144, 227, 242.
Of Fathers, i. 61.
English, ii. 458.

πλήρωμα, i. 313.
Plethi, iii. 195.
Pliny to Trajan, i. 240.
Plumptre, E. H., iii. 385.
Plutarch on Jesus, i. 240.
Plymouthites, iii. 285, 374.
πνεῦμα, i. 209, 345, ii. 211, 240, 242.
ἅγιον, i. 171.
προφητικόν, 172.
πνευματομάχοι, i. 370, 373.
Pnoe, i. 209.
Pœnitentia, iii. 172. *See* Penance.
ποιεῖτε (τοῦτο), iii. 153.
Poinet's Catechism, ii. 442.
Poiret, ii. 452.
On faith, iii. 120.
Lord's Supper, 170.
Christology, 205.
Poland, Unitarianism in, iii. 21.
Polanus, ii. 444.
Original righteousness, iii. 75.
Creatianism, 90.
Polemics, i. 323.
In Middle Ages, ii. 109.
πόλις, i. 317.
Polyander, iii. 24.
Polycarp, i. 84.
Value of alms, 267.
Polytheism, ii. 30.
Pomerania, ii. 420.
Pope as Antichrist, ii. 380.
Head of church, iii. 123. *See* Papacy.
Pope, A., iii. 339.
Pordage, ii. 453.
Porphyry, ii. 4.
Porretanus, Porseta. *See* Gilbert of Poitiers.
Port Royal, iii. 89.
Posidonius on demons, ii. 51.
Powell, B., iii. 319.
Prædestinatus, The work, i. 433.
Præscriptio, i. 128.
Prætorius, Abdias, ii. 423.
Praevostius, iii. 24.
Pragmatic method, i. 18.
Praxeas, i. 77, 180, 181.
Prayers for dead, ii, 97, 98, iii. 385, 387.
Preadamites, iii. 88.
Predestinarians, i. 432.
Predestination, i. 269, 429, ii. 293, iii. 95, 362.
Twofold, i. 431, 433, ii. 295.
Controversies on, iii. 107, 362.
Pre-established harmony, iii. 192.
Pre-existence, i. 211, 404.
Prelacy, Works on, iii. 132, 133.
Presbyterian church government, iii. 133.
Presbyterianism—
In England, ii. 447.
In America, 447.
Presbyters, ii. 373.
Preservation of world, i. 189, ii. 37, iii. 188.
Pressensé, E. de, iii. 286.
Prevenient grace. *See* Grace.
Priesthood, iii. 128.
Universal, 124, 128, 129.
Spiritual, 136.
Priestley, iii. 288.
On eschatology, 386.
Priests, i. 297.
Marriage of, ii. 374.
Age at ordination, 371.
Primacy of Rome, i. 275, ii. 62.
Prinsterer. *See* Van.
Printing, ii. 148.
Priscillian, ii. 341.
Priscillianists, i. 342, ii. 34.
Private confession, iii. 172.
Private masses, iii. 173.
προβολή, i. 353.
Procession of Holy Spirit, i. 371, ii. 218. *See* Holy Spirit, Trinity.
Procopowicz, iii. 305.
Progress, Theology of, iii. 283.
Prohibited degrees in marriage, ii. 374.
Prohibition of Bible, i. 173.
Prolegomena first used, ii. 422.
Proofs of being of God, i. 133, ii. 22. *See* God.
Prophecy, i. 100, ii. 5, 151, iii. 306, 314.
Works on, iii. 320.
Prophets of Zwickau, ii. 426, iii. 17.
Proprietates Dei, iii. 184. *See* God.
Proprietates personales, iii. 184.
προσκύνησις, ii. 319.
Prosper of Aquitaine, i. 337, 421, 434.
πρόσρησις, i. 141.
προσφορά, i. 295.
πρόσωπον, i. 350, 375.
Protestant friends, iii. 312.
Protestantism, Principles of, ii. 406, iii. 37, 39, 53, 231.
Confessions, ii. 415 ff.
Influence on Rome, iii. 2, 8.
Formal and material principles, 36, 37, 122, 143.

Protestantism—
Characteristic doctrines, iii. 39 ff.
Tradition, 44, 67.
Man before fall, 71.
Sin, 77.
Justification and works, 111.
Church, 123.
Ecclesiastical power, 124.
Ministry, 128 ff.
Independence of church, 134.
Worship of saints, 137.
Sacraments, 140.
Mass, 144.
Christology, 197, 206.
Atonement, 209 ff.
Baptism, 220.
Protestantism and Romanism, iii. 36, 39, 71, 111, 122, 140, 148 ff.
Protestants, Union of, with Catholics, iii. 27.
Protoplast, i. 245. *See* Adam, Fall.
Providence, i. 189, ii. 37, 226, iii. 188, 332.
Generalis, specialis, etc., 192.
Prozymites, ii. 363.
Prudentius—
On pre-existence, i. 405.
On resurrection, ii. 92.
Prudentius of Troyes, ii. 295, 297.
Psalm books, i. 31.
Psalterium Beatæ Virginis, ii. 317.
Psellus, ii. 110.
Pseudo-Ambrosius, ii. 82, 347.
Pseudo-Boethius. *See* Boethius.
Pseudo-Chrysostomus, ii. 83.
Pseudo-Clementines. *See* Clementines.
Pseudo-Dionysius, i. 85, ii. 28.
Celestial hierarchy, 42, 45.
Sacraments, 67.
Trinity, 210.
ψυχή, i. 208, 209, 240, 242.
ψυχικοί, i. 208.
Psychology, i. 208. Of scholastics, ii. 239.
Psychopannychy, ii. 392, iii. 386. *See* Thnetopsychites.
Publicani, ii. 110.
Pufendorf, iii. 235.
Pulleyn, R., ii. 125.
On Traducianism, 240.
Conception of Christ, 274.
Godhead and manhood, 275.
Atonement, 285.
The Cup, 356.
Pungens-Asinum, J., ii. 358.
Punishment, Future, i. 320, ii. 101, 396, 404. *See* Eternal Punishment.
Pura naturalia, ii. 247.
Purgatory, i. 312, ii. 94, 388, iii. 317.
Purifying fire, i. 315, ii. 96.
Purists, iii. 62.
Puritans, ii. 457.
Ancient, i. 63.
Pusey, iii. 284.
His school, iii. 281, 314.
Pyrmont, Quakers in, iii. 26.

Q

Quakers, iii. 25 ff.
On clergy, 124.
Church, 127, 131.
Sacraments, 140, 145.
Lord's Supper, 145, 150.
Christology of, 198.
Redemption, 212.
Quenstedt, ii. 405.
On creation, iii. 190.
Providence, iii. 193.
Quesnel, i. 382, iii. 10.
Quia and quatenus, iii. 70.
Quicunque (symbol), i. 381.
Quietists, iii. 11.
Oriental, ii. 233.
Quintilla, i. 285.

R

Rabanus Maurus—
On interpretation, ii. 172.
Predestination, 295.
Sacraments, 321.
Baptism, 334.
Lord's Supper, 339.
Rabbins, ii. 168.
Racovian Catechism, iii. 19, 21.
On interpretation, 47.
Original righteousness, 76.
Original sin, 84.
Freedom and grace, 99.
Lord's Supper, 166.
Person of Christ, 203.
Atonement, 215.
Radbert. *See* Paschasius.
Radical evil (Kant), iii. 340.
Raimund Lullus. *See* Lullus.
Raimund Martini, ii. 108, 109, 244.
Raimund of Sabunde, 132.
On Revelation, 163.
Being of God, 181.

Raimund of Sabunde—
Trinity, ii. 224.
Immortality, 244.
Freedom, 250.
Sacraments, 324.
Orders, 371.
Rainerius, ii. 174.
Ramus, P., ii. 447.
Rascolniks, iii. 305.
Rationalism, iii. 31, 54, 237, 258.
On Scripture, 54, 315.
Christology, 347.
Atonement, 353.
Grace, 365.
Sacraments, 378.
Rationalismus vulgaris, iii. 261, 279.
Rationalistic reaction, iii. 279.
Ratramnus—
On procession of Holy Ghost, ii. 207.
Virginity of Mary, 262.
Predestination, 296.
Lord's Supper, 339.
Reading of Bible. *See* Bible.
Real Presence, i. 290, iii. 149, 159.
Realism, ii. 121, 213, iii. 265.
Reason and revelation, ii. 153, iii. 261.
Rebaptizing, i. 283, 284, ii. 334.
Recared, i. 374.
Rectitude, Primitive. *See* Innocence.
Redditio animæ, iii. 376.
Redemption, i. 252, ii. 52, 275, iii. 209, 353; and
Devil, ii. 53.
Extent of atonement, 61, 302, iii. 95, 107.
Economy of, i. 264, ii. 302, iii. 120.
Redslob, iii. 284.
Rees, T., iii. 21.
Reformation, ii. 406, iii. 36. *See* Protestantism, Lutheranism, Calvinism, etc.
Reformation in its second stage—
German and Swiss, ii. 409.
Reformation, Works on, ii. 406.
Reformed, ii. 431.
Doctrine of Lord's Supper, 161 ff.
On church, ii. 433, iii. 123 ff.
Mysticism, ii. 453, iii. 118.
Creeds, ii. 436 ff., iii. 102.
Christology, 206, 207.
Atonement, 210. *See* Calvinism and the particular Confessions.
Baptism, iii. 221.
Refutatio of 1557, 100.
Regeneration, Baptismal, iii. 220, 375.
Regiaticinum concilium on extreme unction, ii. 369.
Regula Fidei, i. 177.
Reid, T., iii. 292.
Reimarus, iii. 240.
Reinbeck, iii. 236.
Reinhard, iii. 261.
On attributes of God, 327.
Demoniacs, 336.
The fall, 342.
Atonement, 356.
Church, 372.
Sacraments, 376, 379.
Eschatology, 386.
Reinhold, iii. 277.
Reinmar of Zweter, ii. 313.
Reiser, iii. 27.
Relationships in marriage prohibited, ii. 374, 376.
Relics, iii. 138.
Religio, ii. 2, iii. 306.
Religion, History of, i. 11.
Works on, 13.
Defined, ii. 2.
Nature of, 3, iii. 306.
Knowledge of, 8.
Remigius, Archbishop, ii. 297.
Remissio, remissiones peccatorum, i. 265, iii. 213, 216.
Remonstrants, iii. 23.
Articles of, 22, 23.
On Scripture, 44.
Justification, 115.
Trinity, 181. *See* Arminians.
Renasci, i. 282.
Representation of the church, iii. 135.
Reprobation. *See* Predestination.
Res sacramenti, ii. 366.
Resemblance to God. *See* Image.
Restoration, ii. 99. *See* Eschatology.
Resurrection, i. 249, 300, 306, ii. 89, 382.
First, i. 302, ii. 90.
Retribution. *See* Hell.
Rettberg—
On Cyprian and Augustine, i. 269.
On Occam, ii. 360.
Reuchlin, J., ii. 143.
Reusch, P., iii. 236.
Reuss, iii. 234.
Revelation, ii. 2, 153, iii. 306, 309. *See* Reason.
Periods of, i. 109.
Revelation of John. *See* Apocalypse.
Revelation and inspiration. *See* Inspiration.
Reves. *See* Servetus.

Réville, iii. 286.
Revival of letters, ii. 148.
Revue Chrétienne, iii. 286.
Revue de théologie, iii. 285.
Reynolds, E., ii. 457, 461.
Ribow, iii. 236.
Ricci, iii. 300.
Richard of St. Victor, ii. 108, 125.
  On reason, 159, 160.
  Being of God, 180.
  Omnipresence of God, 194.
  Omnipotence, 197.
  Trinity, 223.
  Soul and body, 241.
  Incarnation, 291.
  Grace, 305.
Richter, F., iii. 388.
Ridgeley, ii. 458.
Ridley, ii. 459, iii. 138.
Righteousness, Original. *See* Image.
Ris, iii. 17, 127.
  On Faith, 116.
  Sacraments, 143.
Ritter, G., iii. 277.
Ritter, H.—
  On Erigena, ii. 117.
  Scholasticism, 114, 119.
  Abélard, 124.
  Aquinas, 129.
  Scotus, 130.
Ritualistic movement, iii. 289, 381.
Rivetus, ii. 449, iii. 24.
Robber Synod, i. 393.
Robert of Melun, ii. 127.
Robert Pulleyn. *See* Pulleyn.
Robertson, F. W., iii. 291.
Rochelle. *See* Councils.
Rodaz, iii. 380.
Roger. *See* Bacon.
Röhr, iii. 262, 323, 372.
Rojas. *See* Spinola.
Rokykzana, ii. 146.
Roman baptism, i. 284. *See* Rebaptism.
Roman Catechism—
  On original righteousness, iii. 72.
  Faith, 113.
  Seven sacraments, 141.
  Word of God, 143.
Roman Catholic Church—
  Theology, iii. 4.
  Mysticism, 11.
  Liberal tendencies, 13.
  In Germany, 299. *See* Romanism.
Romanism, ii. 408 ff., iii. 1 ff.
  Formal and material principles, 37, 123.
Romanism—
  Characteristic doctrines, iii. 39.
  Tradition, 67.
  Man before fall, 72.
  Freedom, 83.
  Immaculate conception, 87.
  Predestination, 107.
  Pelagian, 83, 110.
  Justification and works, 111.
  Church, 124.
  Ecclesiastical power, 124.
  The Church a State, 134.
  Worship of saints, 137.
  Sacraments, 140.
  Mass, 148 ff.
  Atonement, 211.
  Baptism, 220.
Romanism and Protestantism, iii. 39.
  See under Protestantism and Romanism.
Rome. *See* Councils.
Ronge, iii. 303.
Roos, iii. 384.
Roscellinus, ii. 123.
  On Trinity, 211.
Rose, iii. 283.
Rosenkranz, i. 24, iii. 277.
Rosenmüller, iii. 316.
Rosicrucians, ii. 430.
Rothe, i. 11, iii. 276.
  On early Christian writers, i. 272.
  Donatists, ii. 70.
  Inspiration, iii. 318.
  Miracles, 319.
  Sin, 343.
  Trinity, 331.
  Church, 373.
Rothmann controversy, iii. 64.
Rottmann, iii. 17.
Rougemont, F. de, iii. 317.
Rousseau, iii. 239.
Royaards, iii. 283.
רוּחַ, i. 146.
רוּחַ אֱלֹהִים, i. 172.
Rucelinus. *See* Roscellinus.
Rückert—
  On Lord's Supper, i. 288, 289, 290.
  Gregory, ii. 80.
  Cyril, 80, 81.
  Ambrose, 82.
Rudelbach on inspiration, ii. 168.
Rufinus—
  On Trinity, i. 383.

Rufinus—
On Revelation, ii. 3.
On Canon, 12, 13.
Unity of God, 31.
Creation, 36.
Redemption, 61.
The church, 66.
Ruge, iii. 276.
Rule of faith, i. 62.
Rupert of Deutz, ii. 108.
On Jews, 108.
Incarnation without sin, ii. 291.
Transubstantiation, 359.
Rupp, iii. 280.
Russian schismatics, iii. 305.
Russo-Greek Church, iii. 305. *See* Greek.
Rutherford, S., ii. 460.
Ruysbroek, J., ii. 139.
On Trinity, 221.
Christology, 273.
Grace, 307.
Transubstantiation, 351.
Ryssel. *See* Alanus.

S

Sabellianism, i. 75, 324, 342, 349 ff., iii. 176, 328.
Sabellius, i. 348.
Sabunde. *See* Raimund.
Sacerdotium, iii. 129.
Sachsenspiegel, ii. 313.
Sack, A. W., iii. 246.
Sacramentarians, ii. 434, iii. 158.
Sacramenti, Integritas, iii. 144.
Sacraments, i. 271, ii. 67, 313, 319, iii. 374.
Idea of, i. 297, ii. 67.
Six, 69, 324.
Seven, 322, iii. 140.
Four, ii. 68, 321.
Twelve, 322.
Three, iii. 142.
Seven or Two, 140.
Pledges of grace, ii. 329.
Exorcism, 68.
In Old Testament, 68, 326.
Necessity of, 325.
See Baptism, Lord's Supper, Confirmation, Orders, Matrimony, Penance, Extreme unction.
Sacramentum, i. 298.
Difference from sacrificium, iii. 152.
Sacramentum necessitatis, dignitatis, consilii, ii. 377.
Sacrifice in Eucharist, i. 295, ii. 86.
Sacrifice of Mass, ii. 346, iii. 148.
Sacrifice and transubstantiation, ii. 352.
Sacrifices of prayer, praise, alms, i. 295.
Sailer, iii. 298, 301.
Saint Cyran, iii. 9.
Saints, Worship of. *See* Worship.
Sale of indulgences. *See* Indulgences.
Sales, Fr. de, iii. 11, 171.
Salisbury. *See* John.
Salmeron, iii. 6.
Salt in baptism, iii. 220.
Salvation, Doctrine of. *See* Soteriology.
Salvian, i. 337.
On Providence, ii. 129, 131.
Salzmann, iii. 241.
Sampsæi, i. 69.
Sancroft, Archbishop, iii. 287.
Sanctification, iii. 111, 362.
Sander, iii. 325.
Sardel. *See* Chardieu.
Sardica. *See* Councils.
Sardinoux, iii. 284.
Sarpi, iii. 1.
Sartorius, iii. 271.
Satan, i. 198, ii. 47.
Restoration of, i. 204, ii. 50, 277, 278. *See* Devil.
Satisfactio, i. 253, 259, iii. 172, 208, 213, 216.
Satisfactio operis, ii. 365.
Satisfaction theory. *See* Atonement.
Saturninus, i. 73.
Saumur, School of, ii. 455.
On original sin, iii. 86.
Saussage, De la, iii. 285.
Savonarola, ii. 146.
On internal testimony, 160.
Inspiration, 168.
Interpretation, 172.
Being of God, 176, 180.
Trinity, 224.
Predestination, 302.
Original sin, 259, 260.
Grace, 307.
Faith, 310.
Church, 316.
Savoy Confession, ii. 445.
Saxon divines, Christology of, iii. 207.
Schad, iii. 265.
Schaffhausen, iii. 282.
Schaller, iii. 277.
Scheffler (Silesius), iii. 12, 191.
Scheibel, iii. 298, 380.

Schelling, iii. 265.
On Revelation, 311.
Theology, 317.
Trinity, 330.
Sin, 341.
Freedom, 341.
Christology, 348, 359.
Schenkel, iii. 278.
On Protestantism, ii. 413, iii. 128.
Religion, 308.
Christology, 352.
Church, 372.
Scherer, iii. 285, 286.
Scherzer, iii. 5.
Schiller, iii. 263, 266.
σχίσμα, i. 63.
Schlegel, iii. 266.
Schleiermacher, iii. 266, 267.
On Artemon, i. 161.
Augustine, ii. 25, 38.
Arminians, iii. 25.
His theology, 270.
On religion, 269, 306, 307.
New Testament, 321.
His Pantheism, 307, 323.
On Trinity, 328, 330, 331.
Angels, 334.
Sin, 342.
Christology, 345, 350.
Atonement, 358, 359.
Election, 367.
Church, 372.
Sacraments, 377.
Eschatology, 385, 388.
Schlichting, iii. 19.
Scripture, 55.
Schliemann, i. 68, 81.
Schlosser, iii. 386.
Schlüsselberg, iii. 203.
Schluter, ii. 452.
Schmalkalden, Articles of, ii. 417.
On Scripture, iii. 43.
Original sin, 81.
Worship of saints, 138.
Word of God, 143.
Transubstantiation, 150.
The Mass, 152.
Lord's Supper, 160.
Penance, 172.
Confession, 172.
Purgatory, 174.
Schmalz, iii. 19.
Catechism, iii. 21.
Schmid, iii. 284.
Schmidlin. *See* Andreä.
Schmidt, C., ii. 98, 191.
Schmidt, C. A. E., iii. 240.
Schneckenburger—
On Calvinism, ii. 433.
Reformed Christology, ii. 433.
Atonement, iii. 211.
Schnepf on Oecolampadius, iii. 157.
Scholasticism, ii. 107 ff., 118, 121, 126, 131, 141, 149.
Three periods, 113.
Protestant, 425, 445.
Scholten, iii. 285.
Scholz, iii. 301.
Schomann, Catechism, iii. 21.
Schott, H. A., iii. 263.
Schröckh on Spener, iii. 229.
Schubert, J. E., iii. 236.
Schulthess, iii. 282.
Schultz, iii. 379.
Schulz, Trial of, iii. 251.
Schulz, D., iii. 379.
Schürmann, Maria V., ii. 452, iii. 137.
Schwabach. *See* Torgau.
Schwabenspiegel, ii. 314.
Schwarz, iii. 356, 378.
Schwarzerd. *See* Melanchthon.
Schwegler, i. 51, iii. 277.
On Nazarenes, 69.
Gnosticism, 72.
Montanism, 75.
Tertullian, 89, 166.
Schweizer, A., iii. 274, 278, 282.
On Anselm, ii. 281.
Lutheranism and Calvinism, 409.
Calvinism, 409, 433, iii. 368.
Zwingli, iii. 80.
Gomarists, 104.
Amyraut, 109.
Atonement, 211.
Schwenkfeld, ii. 427.
On letter and spirit, iii. 50.
Justification, 119.
Lord's Supper, 166.
Glorified flesh of Christ, 197, 201.
Schyn, iii. 117.
Science, ii. 141.
Scientia media, iii. 110.
Scotigena. *See* Erigena.
Scotists, ii. 130, 185, iii. 110
Scottish theology and philosophy, ii. 456, iii. 291.
Scottish National Church, iii. 373.
Scotus, John Duns, ii. 130.
Works, 130.
On reason and revelation, 158.
Inspiration, 168.
Ontological argument, 181, 182.
Knowing God, 184, 185.

Scotus, John Duns—
Attributes, ii. 194.
Freedom of God, 204.
Creation, 228.
Theodicy, 232.
Angelology, 235.
Devil, 237.
Immortality, 244.
Fall of man, 246.
Sin, 256.
Original justice, 259.
Immaculate conception, 264.
Adoptianism, 270.
Atonement, 287.
Incarnation without sin, 291.
Predestination, 301.
Co-operation, 304.
Sacraments, 325, 329.
Eucharist, 340.
Penance, 367.
Marriage, 375.
Resurrection, 385.
Future state, 397.
Scripture, i. 109, 114, 123, ii. 8, 161, iii. 312. *See* Bible Canon.
Scriver, ii. 429.
Second advent. *See* Advent and Eschatology.
Secret marriages, ii. 375.
Secta, i. 63.
Sects, iii. 15.
Sects of the Middle Ages, ii. 303, 313, 325, 326, 331, 365, 380, 388, 396, 404.
Protestant, iii. 16, 27, 49, 122.
Of the Greek Church. *See* under the particular parties and sects.
Secundus, i. 358.
Seekers, iii. 31.
Seiler, G. F., iii. 247.
Self-determination. *See* Freedom.
Selnekker, ii. 422.
Semi-Arians, i. 324, 358, 360, 363, 366.
Semi-Pelagianism, i. 324, 341, 432 ff., *ii. 302.*
Semisch—
On Logos, i. 163.
Justin M., 174.
Angels, 194.
Semler, iii. 246.
On scholastics, ii. 120.
Strigel, 422.
Theories of inspiration, 169.
Religion, iii. 245, 247, 306, 310.
Angels, 334.
Sempiternitas, ii. 193.
Sendomiriensis Consensus, ii. 445.
Senf, iii. 315.
Sens Council, ii. 212.
Sentences, ii. 121.
Septuagint, i. 116.
Sergius, i. 400.
Sermons, Rationalistic, iii. 242.
Serpent, ii. 252. *See* Satan, Fall, etc.
Servatus Lupus on predestination, ii. 296.
Servetus, iii. 20.
On Scripture, 52.
Trinity, 179.
Christology, 203.
Services of early church testify to the Godhead of Christ, i. 240.
Sethites, i. 228.
Seven sacraments. *See* Sacraments.
Severians, i. 398.
Severinus, i. 401.
Severus Sanctus Endelechius, ii. 52.
Shaftesbury, iii. 35.
Sharp, John, ii. 448.
Shekinah, i. 158.
שִׁיעוּר, i. 312.
Shepherd of Hermas. *See* Hermas.
Sherlock, W., iii. 31, 182.
Sibylline oracles, i. 101, ii. 6, 94, 153.
Siegebertus Gemblac, ii. 296.
Sigismund, J., ii. 444.
Sigismund Confession, ii. 439, iii. 165.
Signa (sacramenta), iii. 141.
Silberschlag, iii. 332.
Silesius, Angelus. *See* Scheffler.
Simia Aristotelis, ii. 129. *See* Albert the Great.
Similarity of essence. *See* Homoiousianism.
Similitudo, i. 410, ii. 247.
Simon, R., iii. 14.
On inspiration, 65.
Simon Magus, i. 65.
Simonism, St., iii. 303.
Sin, i. 223, 225, 411, ii. 251.
Of the devils, 202.
Imputed, 217, 233.
Forgiveness, 277.
As negative, 411.
Of Adam, i. 413, 420, ii. 251.
Original, 416, 418, 422.
Lutheran definitions, iii. 92.
Against the Holy Ghost, iii. 92 *See* Original Sin.
Sinlessness of Christ. *See* Christology.
Sinlessness of Mary. *See* Mary.

Sins after baptism, i. 265, ii. 62, 365.
Sintenis, iii. 387.
Sirmian Formula on the Descensus, ii. 61.
Sirmond, i. 433.
Siva, i. 155.
Sixtus IV., ii. 265.
Skelton, iii. 245.
Sleep of soul, i. 314, ii. 392.
Smaragdus, ii. 206.
Smectymnus, iii. 133.
Smith, John, ii. 465.
Smith, J. Pye, iii. 288.
Societies, Religious, iii. 273.
Socinianism, iii. 18, 344.
  On Scripture, 54.
  Inspiration, 60.
  Pelagianism, 99.
  Justification, 115.
  Church, 127.
  Sacraments, 141, 145.
  Lord's Supper, 166.
  Trinity, 181.
  Omniscience of God, 185.
  Creation, 190.
  Angels, 194.
  Person of Christ, 203.
  Atonement, 210.
  Incarnation, 203.
  Baptism, 222.
  Infant baptism, 225.
Socinus, F., iii. 21.
  Catechism, 21.
  On Revelation, 54.
  Scripture, 54.
  Inspiration, 61.
  State of innocence, 76.
  Immortality, 76.
  Original sin, 84.
  Justification, 115.
  Church, 127.
  Lord's Supper, 167.
  Trinity, 180.
  Christology, 181.
  Atonement, 213.
  Baptism, 222.
Socinus, L., iii. 20.
Socrates on Arian controversy, i. 361.
  On Eunomians, ii. 76.
Soissons. *See* Councils.
Sola fides, iii. 112, 118.
Soliloquia animæ, i. 397.
Solutio, Grotian, iii. 216.
Son and Logos. *See* Logos.
Soothsaying, i. 115.
σοφία, i. 156, 172.
Sophronius, i. 400, 401.
Soteriology, i. 237, ii. 53, 267, iii. 95, 197, 362. *See* Redemption.
Soul, 211, 217, 221, 410, ii. 239, 242. *See* Anthropology, Sleep, etc.
Sources of religious knowledge, i. 108, ii. 8, 161, iii. 1.
South, iii. 182.
Southey's Wesley, iii. 256.
Souverain, i. 61, 174.
Sozomen on Macedonius, i. 370.
Spalding, iii. 245.
Spalding, Bishop, iii. 304.
Spangenberg, iii. 255, 330.
Spanheim, F., iii. 109.
Speculative method, i. 18.
Spelman, H., iii. 132.
Spener, ii. 430.
  On sin, iii. 94.
  Inspiration, 64.
  Church and priesthood, 136.
  Creation, 192.
  Eschatology, 229.
σφραγίς, i. 278.
Spinola, Rojas de, iii. 28.
Spinoza, iii. 30, 192, 318, 323.
Spiratio, Trinity, iii. 185.
Spiritual participation in the Supper, iii. 161. *See* Lord's Supper.
Spirituales, ii. 110, 324, 380.
Spitting in the Mass, ii. 339.
Spittler, iii. 247.
Spörri on Zwingli, ii. 434.
Sprinkling, i. 283, ii. 382. *See* Baptism.
Stahl, iii. 281.
Stancarus, F., ii. 419.
  On atonement, iii. 218.
Stanley, A. P., iii. 291.
Stapfer, iii. 236.
Staphylus, iii. 118.
Staroverzi, iii. 305.
State and church. *See* Church.
Status exaltationis, inanitionis, iii. 206.
Staudenmaier, iii. 302.
  On scholastics, ii. 120.
  Erigena, 155.
Stäudlin, iii. 260.
  On Limborch, iii. 24.
Steffens, iii. 298.
Steiger, iii. 262.
Steinbart, iii. 242.
Steinmetz, iii. 256.
Steitz on Chrysostom, ii. 86.
Stephan Gobarus, i. 39.
Stephen de Borbone, ii. 391.

Stephen of Rome, i. 284.
Stercoranists, ii. 339.
Steudel, iii. 359.
Stiebritz, iii. 244.
Stier, iii. 316.
Stilling, J., iii. 257, 384, 386.
Stillingfleet, ii. 454, 462, iii. 182.
στοιχεῖα, i. 62.
Stolz, iii. 282.
Storch, iii. 17.
Storr, iii. 261, 315, 356, 379.
Stosch, iii. 249.
Stourdza, iii. 305.
Strabo, W., ii. 338.
Strähler, iii. 235.
Strassburg, ii. 149, iii. 282.
Strauss, D. F., iii. 277, 282.
On ideal Christ, i. 52, iii. 346, 349.
Eucharist, i. 289.
Socinianism, iii. 21.
Miracles, 319.
Being of God, 327.
Christology, 351.
Schleiermacher, 368.
The church, 372.
Immortality, 388.
Strigel, V., ii. 422.
Against Flacius, ii. 419.
Ströbel, iii. 380.
St. Simonism, iii. 303.
Stübner, iii. 17.
Studien und Kritiken, iii. 279.
Studita, Theodore, ii. 257, 318, 324.
Stunden v. Andacht, iii. 263.
Sturm, iii. 377.
Suadela in Irenæus, i. 258.
Suarez, iii. 7.
Sub utraque forma, ii. 356, 362.
Subdiaconi, ii. 373.
Sublapsarianism, iii. 95, 103.
Subordination of the Son, i. 178, 352.
Subsequent will. *See* Will.
Substantia, i. 375. *See* Transubstantiation.
Suevic Confession, ii. 437.
Suevic Syngramma, iii. 157.
Sufferings of Christ, divine or human, iii. 218. *See* Death of Christ.
Sulzer, J. G., iii. 386.
Sulzer, S., iii. 170.
σύμβολον, i. 7, 281, 293.
Summas, iii. 127.
συνάφεια, i. 390, 392.
συνάξις, i. 288.
συνουσιασταί, i. 389.
Supererogation, Works of, ii. 308.
Supernaturalism, iii. 55, 258.
Rational supernaturalism, 259.
Superstition, Protestant, iii. 221.
Supralapsarianism, iii. 95, 103.
Suso, Henry, ii. 138.
On knowledge of God, 187.
Pantheism, 191.
Trinity, 221.
Creation, 230.
Atonement, 289.
Grace, 306.
Lord's Supper, 354.
Heaven, 400.
Eternal punishment, 405.
Süsskind, iii. 261, 315.
Swamerdam, ii. 452.
Sweden, iii. 281.
Swedenborg, iii. 257.
On interpretation, 321.
Angels and devils, 321, 334.
Christ and Trinity, 328, 329.
Sin, 342.
Christology, 346.
Atonement, 355.
Imputation, 366.
Church, 371.
Eschatology, 386.
Swiss Reformation, ii. 432. *See* Zwingli, Calvin, etc.
Switzerland, iii. 283.
Swords, The two, ii. 312.
Sylvester II. *See* Gerbert.
Symbolical books of Reformed, ii. 436, 437.
Symbolical view of Supper, ii. 78, 337, iii. 154.
Symbolism, i. 7, 9.
Symbolism in worship, iii. 123.
Symbolism, Age of, ii. 406.
Symbolism in art, i. 35.
Symbols, Ecclesiastical, i. 8.
Symbolum, Quicunque, i. 38. *See* Athan. Creed.
Syncretism, ii. 429, iii. 27.
Synergism, ii. 303, 419, iii. 100.
Synesius, ii. 91.
Syngramma Suevicum. *See* Suevic.
Synnada. *See* Councils.
Synods. *See* Councils.
Cambridge, ii. 445.
Delft, 454.
Dort, 444.
Loudun, ii. 455.
Synoptic evangelists, i. 51.
Synteresis, ii. 242.
Synthetic method, ii. 423.

Systematic theology, ii. 445. *See* Theology.
Système de la nature, iii. 238.
Systems, Modern German, of theology, iii. 243.
Syzygies, i. 162.

T

TABLES of church history, i. 43.
Of history of doctrines, i. 43.
Taborites, ii. 146.
Tafel, iii. 257.
Tajo of Saragossa, ii. 115.
ταπεινωσιγραφία, iii. 208.
Tarragona. *See* Councils.
Tatian, i. 87.
On Logos, 164.
Creation, 186.
Angels, 196.
Demons, 201, 204, 205.
Fall of Satan, 202.
Anthropology, 208.
Image of God, 209.
Freedom, 218.
Immortality, 222.
Fall, 234.
Judgment, 313.
Tauler, ii. 137.
On inspiration, 170.
Pantheism, 183, 192.
Omnipresence, 196.
Trinity, 220.
Angels, 236.
Fall, 252.
Christology, 273.
Atonement, 289.
Assurance, 304.
Salvation, 306.
Mary, 317.
Lord's Supper, 354.
Taute, iii. 277.
Taylor, I., iii. 386.
Taylor, Jeremy, ii. 462.
Taylor of Norwich, iii. 245.
Taylor, N. W., iii. 296.
Tears. *See* Baptism.
τεκμήρια, iii. 221.
Teleological argument, i. 133.
Telesio, iii. 30.
Teller, iii. 242, 248, 306.
Territorial system, iii. 369.
Tertullian, i. 89.
Works, 90.
On inspiration, 119.
Tradition, 128, 129.
Being of God, 135.
Tertullian—
Anthropomorphism, i. 147.
Holiness of God, i. 151.
Penalty, 152.
Logos, 166.
Holy Spirit, 173, 174, 175.
Trinity, 178, 179.
Creation, 187.
Providence, 190.
Angels, 195.
Demons, 199, 200.
Anthropology, 210.
Traducianism, 213.
Image of God, 215.
Freedom, 220.
Immortality, 223.
Sin, 225, 235.
Fall, 228, 229, 235.
Christology, 238, 243, 245.
Christ sinless, 250.
Redemption, 255.
Satisfaction, 259.
Hades, 264.
Penitence, 266, 267.
Justification, 268.
Grace, 268.
Predestination, 269.
Church, 273, 277.
Roman primacy, 276.
Baptism, 280, 283, 285.
Infant baptism, 282.
Lord's Supper, 291, 296.
Sacraments, 298.
Final resurrection, 302.
Chiliasm, 303, 305.
Resurrection, 309, 314.
Judgment, 314.
Intermediate state, 314.
Future state, 320.
Tessard, iii. 109.
Testament of Twelve Patriarchs, i. 263.
Testamentum, i. 111, 119.
Testimonium animæ, i. 133.
Testimony of the Spirit, iii. 63.
Tetrapolitan Confession, ii. 437.
On Lord's Supper, iii. 161.
Tetratheism, i. 379, ii. 210, 212.
Tetzel, ii. 407.
Thaddeus in Eusebius, i. 263.
Thaer, iii. 240.
Thalia of Arius, i. 353.
Thamer, iii. 51, 213.
θεάνθρωπος, i. 249.
Theiner, iii. 304.
Theism, ii. 188, iii. 31, 322.
θέλημα ἑπόμενον, προηγούμενον, ii. 232.

Themistius, i. 398.
Theodicy, ii. 40, 226, iii. 188, 332. *See* Providence.
Theodore Abukara, ii. 272.
Theodore of Mopsuestia, i. 332.
On Holy Spirit, 373.
Nestorianism, 390.
Augustinianism, 431.
Inspiration, ii. 16.
Interpretation, 18.
Redemption, 60.
Punishment, 104.
Theodore of Pharan, i. 402.
Theodore Studita, ii. 324.
Theodoret of Cyrus, i. 332.
On Holy Spirit, 373.
Traducianism, 407.
Augustinianism, 432.
Apologetics, ii. 5.
Interpretation, 18.
Providence, 39.
Angelolatry, 44.
Devil, 49.
Lord's Supper, 83.
Theodosius, i. 392.
Theodotus, i. 76, 161.
Theodulph of Orleans, ii. 205.
Theognis of Nicæa, i. 358.
Theognostus, i 346.
Theologia elenctica, i. 9.
Theologia Germanica. *See* Deutsche Theologie.
Theologia irregenitorum, iii. 120.
Theologische Jahrbücher, iii. 279.
Theologische Zeitschrift, iii. 279.
Theology and philosophy. *See* Philosophy.
Theology proper, i. 134, 140, 324, 344, ii. 175.
Theology of the Fathers, i. 79.
Scholastic, ii. 121.
Roman Catholic, iii. 4.
Of Jesuits, 4, 8.
In France, ii. 455, iii. 282.
In England, ii. 456, iii. 282, 286, 288.
In Scotland, ii. 458, iii. 291.
In New England, 458.
In United States, 282, 294.
Puritan, ii. 458.
Lutheran, 421.
Calvinistic, 445.
German Reformed, 451.
Modern, iii. 270.
Mediation, 306, 316.
Theonas, i. 358.
Theopaschites, i. 396.
Theophanies, ii. 163.
Theophilanthropinism, iii. 303.
Theophilus of Alexandria, ii. 91.
Theophilus of Antioch, i. 87.
On inspiration, 117.
Being of God, 136.
The name of God, 141.
Unity of God, 150.
The attributes of God, 150.
Logos, 164.
Holy Spirit, 173, 175.
Trinity, 177.
Creation, 184, 185.
Freedom, 218.
Immortality, 222.
Fall, 229, 230, 420.
Faith, 267.
Baptism, 379.
Eschatology, 303.
Resurrection, 309.
Theophylact, ii. 112.
On Eucharist, ii. 364.
Θεὸς ἄῤῥητος, i. 162.
Theosophy, Lutheran, ii. 426. *See* Mysticism.
Θεοτόκος, i. 391. *See* Mary.
Theramo, Jacob de, ii. 290.
Therese a Jesu, iii. 12.
Thesaurus meritorum, supererogationis, ii. 311.
Theses of Luther, ii. 407.
Of Harms, iii. 272.
Thilo, iii. 277.
Thirty-nine Articles, ii. 439, 442.
On tradition, iii. 68.
Original sin, 83.
Predestination, 111.
Justification, 117.
Church, 131.
Sacraments, 142.
Ministry and sacraments, 144.
Lord's Supper, 167.
Purgatory, 174.
Thnetopsychites, i. 312, ii. 392.
Tholuck—
On Gruner, iii. 249.
School of Halle, 251.
Apologists, 245.
Semler, 246.
Jansenism, 303.
Sin, 342.
Thomas. *See* Aquinas.
Thomas à Kempis. *See* Kempis.
Thomas of Bradwardine. *See* Bradwardine.
Thomas of Cellano, ii. 381.
Thomas-Christians, i. 393.

Thomasius, iii. 278.
On redemption, ii. 55.
Thomasius, Chr., ii. 430.
On Church and State, iii. 136, 371.
Demons, 195.
Thomists, ii. 130, 185, iii. 110.
Thorn Colloquy, iii. 28.
Thorn Declaration, ii. 439, 444.
On immaculate conception, iii. 87.
Thorndike, iii. 132.
Thummius, iii. 208.
θυσία, i. 295, ii. 79, iii. 153.
Thysius, iii. 24.
Tichonius on the church, ii. 65.
Tieck, iii. 266.
Tiedge, iii. 263.
Tieftrunk, iii. 259, 379.
Tigurinus, Consensus, ii. 439.
On Lord's Supper, iii. 164.
Tillotson, ii. 454, 466, iii. 287.
Timor filialis, servilis, ii. 366.
Tindal, M., iii. 31, 35.
Titus of Bostra, ii. 30.
On resurrection, 90.
Toland, iii. 31, 34.
Toledo. *See* Councils.
Töllner on Word of God, iii. 312.
On Trinity, 328.
Atonement, 355.
Tonsure, ii. 372.
Toplady, iii. 288.
Torgau Articles, ii. 416.
Torments of hell, ii. 396. *See* Eschatology, etc.
Torquemada, ii. 265.
Toulouse Council on Bible-reading, ii. 173.
τοῦτό ἐστι, i. 289.
Tractarians. *See* Oxford School, Puseyites.
Tracts for the Times, iii. 289.
Tradition, i. 108, 127, ii. 8, 20, 161.
Protestant sense of, iii. 44, 67.
Traditionalism—
Roman See on, iii. 312.
Traditor, ii. 63.
Traducianism, i. 211, 404, ii. 239, iii. 88. *See* Anthropology.
Traheren, Dean, Letter to Bullinger, ii. 460.
Transitio, ii. 345.
Transsubstantiatio first used by Hildebert, ii. 345.
Transubstantiation, ii. 78, 337.
Referred to the whole Trinity, 351.
See Lord's Supper.
Travers, ii. 461.
Trechsel on Samosatianism, i. 351.
On Anabaptists and Unitarians, iii. 19.
Treneh, R. C., on Miracles, iii. 319.
Trent, Council of, iii. 1.
On Scripture, 45, 46, 48.
Apocrypha, 46.
Interpretation, 46.
Vulgate, 48.
Original righteousness, 72.
Original sin, 83.
Freedom, 83, 96.
Immaculate conception, 87.
Predestination, 96.
Justification, 96, 112.
Faith, 113.
Saints and images, 138, 140.
Number of sacraments, 141.
Opus operatum, 145.
Transubstantiation, 151.
Lord's Supper, Mass, 152.
Penance, 145, 172.
Purgatory, 173.
Trèves, Coat of, iii. 303.
Triads, i. 155, 172, 176.
τριάς, i. 172, 176, 177, 364. *See* Trinity.
Trichotomy, i. 208, 387, 409. *See* Anthropology.
Trimurti, i. 155.
Trinitarians, iii. 176.
Trinitas, i. 298.
Trinity, i. 172 ff., 176, 324, 345, 348, 371, 374, ii. 204, 211, iii. 18, 327.
Formulas, i. 374, iii. 185.
In creation, ii. 36, iii. 190.
In Old Testament, 188.
In history of world, ii. 225.
Transubstantiated, 351.
Trisagion, i. 397.
Tritheism, i. 178, 379, ii. 210, iii. 182.
Trithemius Chronicle, ii. 379.
Triumphant church. *See* Church.
Triune God, iii. 177.
Trollet, iii. 285.
Tronchin, iii. 109.
τρόπος ἀντιδόσεως, ii. 267.
Trullan Council, First, i. 401.
Truth of Christianity. *See* Evidences.
Tübingen divines, iii. 15, 208.
School (Baur), i. 57, iii. 316.
τύπος, i. 401, ii. 79.
Turlupines, ii. 110.
Turrecremata, ii. 265.
Turretin, A., ii. 454, iii. 66, 235.

Turretin, F., ii. 444.
Twesten, iii. 278, 311.
Tyre. *See* Councils.
Tzschirner, iii. 263.

U

Ubiquity of Christ's body, iii. 149, 159. *See* Christology and Lord's Supper.
Udo. *See* Audæus, i. 410.
Ueberfeldt, ii. 429.
Uhlich, iii. 280.
Ulfilas, ii. 166.
Ullmann—
On Gregory the Great and Augustine, i. 415.
Baptism, ii. 71.
Scholastics, 120.
Nicolas of Methone, 112, 219, 277, 364.
Printing, 150.
Trinity, 219.
Wessel, 288, 362.
Christology, 351.
Ulrici, iii. 275.
On Feuerbach, 280.
Ultra-Lutherans, iii. 314.
Umbreit, iii. 321.
Unbaptized, Dying, ii. 74, 103.
Uncreated light. *See* Taborites.
Unction, Extreme, ii. 368, iii. 172.
Repetition of, ii. 369.
Underwald, i. 263. *See* Hades.
Unio mystica, iii. 121.
Unio personalis, iii. 206.
Unio sacramentalis, iii. 270.
Union, Attempts at. *See* Syncretism.
Unitarians, i. 180, iii. 16, 18.
In England, 18, 22.
Controversy in England, 22, 287.
In New England, 295. *See* Socinianism.
United Brethren, ii. 313, iii. 253.
United States. *See* America.
Unity of church. *See* Church.
Unity of God, i. 138, ii. 30.
Universal church, iii. 135. *See* Church.
Universalism of grace, ii. 455, iii. 104, 385.
Universalismus hypotheticus, iii. 107.
Universal priesthood. *See* Priesthood.
Unleavened bread. *See* Lord's Supper.
Upsal University, iii. 235.
Urban IV., ii. 346.
Urban VIII., iii. 9, 110.
Urim, iii. 195.
Urlsperger, iii. 253, 329.
Ursinus, ii. 439, 491, iii. 185.
Ussher, ii. 460.
On ordination, iii. 133.
Usteri on atonement, iii. 361.
Uytenbogard, iii. 24.

V

Valdez, J., iii. 20.
Valence. *See* Councils.
Valencia controversy on transubstantiation, ii. 351.
Valentinians, i. 72, 208, 278, ii. 262, iii. 197.
Valentinus, i. 162, 243, 278.
Valla, Laurentius, ii. 143.
Van Ess, iii. 301.
Van Hemmert, iii. 315.
Van Oosterzee, iii. 285.
Van Prinsterer, iii. 285.
Vanini, iii. 30.
Variata of Augsburg Confession, ii. 416.
Vasa irae et misericordiæ, i. 429.
Vasquez, iii. 7.
Vatke, iii. 308.
Vaud, Canton de, iii. 282.
Venantius Fortunatus, i. 382.
Venial sins, ii. 252.
Vera, iii. 275.
Vercelli. *See* Councils.
Vergerius, iii. 20.
Vergier, Jean du. *See* St. Cyran.
Vicarious satisfaction. *See* Atonement.
Vicarious suffering. *See* Atonement.
Victor, School of St., ii. 136, 168, 241, 273. *See* Hugo, Richard, Walter, William.
Vienne. *See* Councils.
Vigilius Tapsensis, i. 382.
Vincent of Lérins, i. 336.
On tradition, ii. 22.
Vincent of Nismes, iii. 284.
Vinet, iii. 274, 284, 285, 372.
Viret, iii. 162.
Virgilius, ii. 231.
Virginity of Mary. *See* Mary.
Virtues of heathen, iii. 78, 107.
Virtus instrumentalis, ii. 325.
Vishnu, i. 155.
Visible church. *See* Church.
Visigoths, i. 374.

Vitium Originis, i. 231. *See* Original Sin.
Vitringa on baptism, iii. 221.
Vladislas IV., ii. 444.
Voëtius, ii. 449, 453.
Vogel, iii. 315.
Vogt, iii. 324.
Völkel, iii. 19.
Voltaire, iii. 238.
Voluntas antecedens, consequens, ii. 231. *See* θέλημα.
Voss, iii. 266.
Vowel points, iii. 62.
Vridankes Bescheidenheit, ii. 313.
Vulgate, iii. 40.

W

Wafers, Consecrated, ii. 362.
Wagner, iii. 332.
Wake, Archbishop, ii. 463.
Walæus, iii. 24.
Walafried Strabo, ii. 338.
Walch, C. W. F., on Felix, ii. 269.
Walch, J. G., iii. 256.
Waldenses, ii. 313, 324.
  On penance, 310.
  Allegorizing on penance, 367.
  On purgatory, 391.
Waldschmidt, iii. 367.
Wallis, iii. 182.
Walter of St. Victor, ii. 128, 271.
Warburton, iii. 245.
  On Jewel, ii. 459.
  On law, iii. 287.
Ward, W. G., iii. 304.
Wardlaw, R., iii. 293.
Washing of feet, ii. 69, iii. 17, 143.
Water of baptism, iii. 223.
  Mystical sense, ii. 330.
  Substitutes, 331.
Waterland, ii. 459, 462.
  On Ath. Creed, i. 382.
  On Arianism, ii. 459, iii. 22, 182.
Waterlandians, iii. 17.
Watson, R., iii. 245.
Watson, T., ii. 458.
Wegscheider, iii. 262.
  Religion, 307.
  Pantheism, 323.
  Trinity, 328.
  Atonement, 358.
  Grace, 365.
  Church, 372.
Weigel, ii. 428.
  On Scripture, iii. 63.
  Person of Christ, 205.
Weimar, Disputation of, ii. 419.
Weishaupt, iii. 241.
Weisse, C. H., iii. 277, 278.
  On religion, 307.
  Miracles, 318.
  Trinity, 331.
  Spirits, 337.
Weissenborn on pantheism, iii. 323.
Weissmann, iii. 235.
Welch, Dr., iii. 293.
Wells, iii. 22.
Wendelin, ii. 449.
Werenfels, ii. 455, iii. 235.
  On interpretation of Scripture, 66.
Wertheim version of Bible, 242.
Wesel, J., ii. 47.
  On the church, 315.
Wesel, Synod, ii. 441.
Wesley, J., iii. 256, 287.
Wessel, J., ii. 146.
  On Scripture, 163.
  Knowledge of God, 183.
  Nature of God, 192.
  Trinity, 225.
  Demonology, 238.
  Image of God, 249.
  Freedom, 251.
  Christology, 274, 291.
  Atonement, 288, 302.
  Incarnation, 292.
  Faith, 310.
  Church, 315.
  Opus operatum, 330.
  Lord's Supper, 355.
  Transubstantiation, 362.
  Penance, 365, 368.
  Purgatory, 388, 391.
Wessenberg and his School, iii. 301.
Westcott, iii. 318.
Western Church, i. 340, ii. 113, 210, 256. *See* Latin.
Westminster Assembly, ii. 445, 458.
Westminster Confession, ii. 445.
  On original sin, iii. 83.
  Decrees, freedom, redemption, 106.
  Predestination, 106.
  Church, 126.
  Sacraments, 143.
  Lord's Supper, 167.
  Baptism, 225.
  Lay baptism, 226.
Westphal, iii. 164.
Wetstein, iii. 243, 328, 386.
Wette, De. *See* De Wette.
Whately, iii. 291, 386.
Whichcote, B., ii. 465.
White, E., iii. 385.

Whitefield, iii. 256, 288.
Whitgift, Archbishop, ii. 459.
Wieland, iii. 241.
Wigand, ii. 423, iii. 3.
Wiggers, i. 419, 438.
Wilberforce, H. W., iii. 290.
Wilberforce, R. J., iii. 290.
Wilkins, D., iii. 132.
Will of God, ii. 203.
  Antecedent and consequent, 227, 234.
Willett, And., iii. 133.
William of Auvergne, ii. 244.
William of Champeaux, ii. 125, 136.
Williams, Ed., ii. 459.
Williams, R., iii. 291.
Wills in Christ. *See* Monothelites.
Wilson, Matthias, ii. 466.
Wimpina, iii. 4.
Wine in Eucharist, i. 291.
Winer, iii. 273.
  On Augsburg apology, ii. 417.
  Scripture, iii. 47.
  Arminians, 97.
  Sacrifice of mass, 151.
Wisdom, i. 156, 168, 171, 345, ii. 222, 226.
Wiseman, iii. 304.
  On Amphilochius, ii. 77
Wislicenus, iii. 280, 314.
Wissowatius, iii. 19.
Witches, ii. 236, iii. 193.
Withholding of cup. *See* Cup.
Witsius, ii. 450.
Wittenberg divines, iii. 121.
Wittenberg University, ii. 418.
Wizel, iii. 5.
Wolf, philosophy, iii. 233.
Wolfenbüttel Fragments, iii. 237, 239, 345.
Wollebius, ii. 448.
Wöllner, iii. 250.
Woltersdorf, iii. 251.
Wolzogen, iii. 19.
Woolstan, iii. 31, 35.
Worcester. *See* Councils.
Word, The. *See* Logos.
Word of God. *See* Bible, iii. 312.
Wordsworth, Bp. Chr., iii. 318.
Works. *See* Faith, Penance, Supererogation, etc.
World, End of. *See* Eschatology.
Worship of angels, i. 197, ii. 41, iii. 193.
  Forbidden, ii. 42, 44.
  Of images. *See* Image-worship.
Worship—
  Of saints, ii. 317, iii. 137.
  Of Virgin. *See* Mary.
Würtemberg Confession—
  On angels, iii. 194.
Wuttke, iii. 234.
Wykliffe, John de, ii. 145.
  Works, 145.
  On Scripture, 163, 164.
  Faith, 164.
  Atonement, 288.
  Predestination, 302.
  Indulgences, 311.
  Universal priesthood, 314.
  Number of sacraments, 324.
  Opus operatum, 329.
  Confirmation, 336.
  Transubstantiation, 358, 360.
  Confession, 365, 368.
  Pope as Antichrist, 381.
  Purgatory, 388, 391.
Wyttenbach, iii. 236.

X

Xenaias, i. 398.
Xenophanes, i. 145.
Ximenes, ii. 143.

Y

υἱοπάτωρ, i. 350.
υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ, i. 170.
  μονογενής, 159.
  πρωτόγονος, 159.
ὕλη, i. 185, 186. *See* Matter.
ὑπόστασις, i. 348, 374, 379, 380, iii. 119.
ὑστάσπης, i. 107.
Yvon, ii. 452.

Z

Zacharia, iii. 247.
Zanchius, iii. 101.
Zeitschrift f. Christl. Wiss., iii. 279.
Zeitschrift für d. g. luth. Theologie, iii. 298.
Zeitschrift f. Prot. u. Kirche, iii. 299.
Zeitschrift f. wissenschaftl. Theol., iii. 279.
Zeitstimmen, iii. 283.
Zeller, iii. 277.
Zend, i. 154.
Zeno, Emperor, i. 396.
Zeno of Verona, i. 347.
Zenobia, i. 352.

Zczschwitz, iii. 274.
Zigabenus. See Euthymius-Zigabenus.
Zinzendorf, iii. 253, 254, 302, 366.
On Trinity, 328, 329.
Atonement, 353.
Church, 371.
Zollikoffer, iii. 246.
Zoroaster, i. 155.
Zosimus, i. 421.
Zschokke, iii. 263.
Zürich, iii. 282, 283.
Reform in, 164.
Zürich Disputation, iii. 151.
Zürich Letters, ii. 460.
Zwickau prophets, ii. 426, iii. 17, 49.
Zwingli, ii. 407, 432.
Works, 432, 434.
Influence, 436.
Fidei ratio, 437.
On Anabaptists, iii. 17.
Zwingli—
On Scripture, iii. 41, 47.
Inspiration, 58.
Original righteousness, 73, 75.
Original sin, 79.
Decrees, 102.
Virtues of heathen, 103.
Priesthood, 129.
Discipline, 134.
Sacraments, 145.
Lord's Supper, 154, 162.
Absolution, 172.
Intermediate state, 174.
Providence, 189.
Preservation, 192.
Satan, 194.
Incarnation, 198.
Alloeosis, 199.
Atonement, 211.
Baptism, 220.
Zwinglian sacraments, iii. 141.

END OF VOLUME III.

MORRISON AND GIBB, EDINBURGH,
PRINTERS TO HER MAJESTY'S STATIONERY OFFICE.


00111691

Digitized with financial assistance from the
Government of Maharashtra
on 18 July, 2018